arXiv:1406.4555v3 [math.RT] 22 Jun 2015

AUSLANDER-REITEN QUIVER OF TYPE D AND GENERALIZED QUANTUM AFFINE SCHUR-WEYL DUALITY

SE-JIN OH

Abstract. We first provide an explicit combinatorial description of the Auslander-Reiten quiver Γ^Q of finite type D. Then we can investigate the categories of finite dimensional representations over the quantum affine algebra $U_q'(D_{n+1}^{(i)})$ $(i = 1, 2)$ and the quiver Hecke algebra $R_{D_{n+1}}$ associated to D_{n+1} $(n \geq 3)$, by using the combinatorial description and the generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality functor. As applications, we can prove that Dorey's rule holds for the category $\mathrm{Rep}(R_{D_{n+1}})$ and prove an interesting difference between multiplicity free positive roots and multiplicity non-free positive roots.

Introduction

The quiver Hecke algebras, introduced by Khovanov-Lauda [25, 26] and Rouquier [33], are in the limelight among the people in the representation research area because the algebras are related to categorification of quantum groups. Recently, the quiver Hecke algebras attract the people's attention once again because the algebras can be understood as a generalization of the affine Hecke algebra of type A in the context of the quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality, which makes bridge between the representations of quiver Hecke algebras and the quantum affine algebras $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$, by the results of Kang, Kashiwara and Kim [21, 22].

For the quantum affine algebra $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$, the finite dimensional integrable representations over $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$ have been investigated by many authors during the past twenty years from different perspectives (see [1, 7, 8, 12, 15, 23, 28]). Among these aspects, the theory of R-matrix provides crucial information for constructing the quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality functor in [21, 22] (see also [10, 11, 14, 19]).

As a continuation of the previous series paper [30], we provide an explicit combinatorial description of the Auslander-Reiten(AR) quiver Γ_Q of finite type D and apply the combinatorial description to investigate

(i) the category $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(i)}$ $(i = 1, 2)$, consisting of finite dimensional integrable modules over the quantum affine algebra $U_q'(D_{n+1}^{(i)})$ depending on the AR-quiver Γ_Q ([16, 18]),

(ii) the category $\mathrm{Rep}(R_{D_{n+1}})$, consisting of finite dimensional graded modules over the quiver Hecke algebra $R_{D_{n+1}}$ associated to D_{n+1} $(n \geq 3)$,

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 05E10, 16T30, 17B37; Secondary 81R50.

Key words and phrases. Auslander-Reiten quiver, quiver Hecke algebra, generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality.

with the exact quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality functor

$$\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)} : R_{D_{n+1}} \longrightarrow \mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)}.$$

Here Q is any Dynkin quiver of finite type D_{n+1} by orienting edges of Dynkin diagram of finite type D_{n+1}.

Let Φ_n^+ be the set of all positive roots associated to finite Dynkin diagram of finite type A_n, D_n, E_6, E_7 or E_8. Then it is well-known ([13]) that

(i) the vertices of Γ_Q can be identified with the set Φ_n^+ and the set of all isomorphism classes of indecomposable modules over the path algebra $\mathbb{C}Q$,
(ii) the dimension vector of indecomposable module corresponding $\beta \in \Gamma_Q$ is indeed β,
(iii) arrows in Γ_Q present the irreducible morphisms between the indecomposables,
(iv) Γ_Q provides *the unique convex partial order* $\prec_Q$ on Φ_n^+ which is compatible with paths in Γ_Q ([4]).

Note that each positive root β in Φ_n^+ of finite type D can be expressed by the tuple of integers $\{a, \pm b\}$ $(1 \le a < b \le n)$ where $\beta = \varepsilon_a \pm \varepsilon_b$. We say ε_a and $\pm\varepsilon_b$ as summands of β. Identifying β with $\{a, \pm b\}$, every positive root appearing in the *maximal N-sectional* (resp. *S-sectional*) path and *the maximal swing* in Γ_Q share the same summand as ε_a or $\pm\varepsilon_b$ (Theorem 1.20, Theorem 1.23).

With the explicit combinatorial description of Γ_Q of finite type D_n, we can prove that the *Dorey's rule* in [9] always holds for all $\alpha \prec_Q \beta \in \Phi_n^+$ with $\gamma = \alpha + \beta \in \Phi_n^+$ (Section 3); i.e., the following surjective homomorphisms exist:

$$V_Q(\beta) \otimes V_Q(\alpha) \to V_Q(\gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad S_Q(\beta) \circ S_Q(\alpha) \to S_Q(\gamma), \quad \text{where}$$

- $V_Q(\beta) := V(\varpi_i)_{(-q)^p}$ is the fundamental $U_q'(D_n^{(1)})$-module for $\phi^{-1}(\beta, 0) = (i, p)$,
- $S_Q(\beta)$ is the simple R_{D_n}-module which is the preimage of $V_Q(\beta)$ under the functor $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$, which is studied in [22].

For a total order $<$ on Φ_n^+, a pair (α, β) with $\alpha < \beta$ is called a *minimal pair* of $\gamma \in \Phi_n^+$ if (i) $\gamma = \alpha + \beta$, (ii) there exists *no* pair (α', β') such that $\gamma = \alpha' + \beta'$ and $\alpha < \alpha' < \gamma < \beta' < \beta$.

We call a positive root $\beta = \sum_k n_k \alpha_k \in \Phi_n^+$ *multiplicity free* if $n_k \le 1$ for all $1 \le k \le n$. Note that there exist positive roots of Φ_n^+ of finite type D which are not multiplicity free. Abstracting this notion, we can define a notion of *multiplicity* on *non-simple* positive roots as follows:

Definition. For every non-simple positive root $\gamma \in \Phi_n^+$ associated to the finite Dynkin diagram of finite type A, D and E, the *multiplicity* of $\gamma = \sum_{i \in I} n_i \alpha_i \in \Phi_n^+$ is the integer $\mathrm{mul}(\gamma)$ defined as follows:

$$\mathrm{mul}(\gamma) := \max\{n_i \mid i \in I\}.$$

Using the combinatorial properties of Γ_Q, we can prove [30, Conjecture] when Q is of finite type D:

Theorem. For any Dynkin quiver Q of finite type D, every pair (α, β) of a non-simple positive root $\gamma = \alpha + \beta \in \Phi_n^+$ is minimal with respect to a suitable total order compatible with $\prec_Q$ if and only if γ is multiplicity free.

In other word, for a non-simple positive root $\gamma \in \Phi_{D_n}^+$ with $\mathrm{mul}(\gamma) \geq 2$ has a pair (α, β) which can not be minimal for *any* total order compatible with $\prec_Q$. We also prove that there exist$(n-b-1)$-pairs (α, β) of multiplicity non-free positive root $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b = \alpha + \beta$ $(1 < b \leq n-2)$ such that they can not be *minimal* (Theorem 3.17). Hence, by regarding *the height* and *the* $k \geq$*-supports* of $\gamma \in \Phi^+$ $(k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1})$, we know the number of (minimal, non-minimal) pairs of γ very easily (Corollary 3.19).

In Remark 3.14, we give an example explaining that the interesting difference between multiplicity free positive roots and multiplicity non-free positive roots happens only when the reduced expression is *adapted to some Dynkin quiver* Q.

In Theorem 3.21, for a pair (α, β) with $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi_n^+$, $\phi^{-1}(\alpha, 0) = (k, p)$ and $\phi^{-1}(\beta, 0) = (l, q)$, we explain that (i) $(-q)^{|p-q|}$ is a root of the denominator $d_{k,l}(z)$ between fundamental representations over $U_q'(D_n^{(1)})$, (ii) the *minimality* of a pair (α, β) can be interpreted as the *multiplicity* of $(-q)^{|p-q|}$ as a root of $d_{k,l}(z)$. In other words, we can extract factors of $d_{k,l}(z)$ by reading *any* Γ_Q with respect to the pairs (α, β) such that $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi_n^+$, $\phi^{-1}(\alpha, 0) = (k, p)$ and $\phi^{-1}(\beta, 0) = (l, q)$.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Section 1, we first recall the definition AR-quivers Γ_Q and their basic theories, review the various orders on Φ_n^+, and study new combinatorial characterization of Γ_Q of finite type D. In Section 2, we briefly recall the backgrounds, theories of the generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality, and observe the similarity arising from the denominators and Dorey's type morphisms of $R_{k,l}^{\mathrm{norm}}(z)$ the quantum affine algebra $\mathfrak{g} = D_{n+1}^{(1)}$ and $\mathfrak{g} = D_{n+1}^{(2)}$. In Section 3, we prove how the structure of Γ_Q reflects the Dorey's rule for $D_n^{(1)}$ and study the minimality of given pair (α, β) of $\gamma = \alpha + \beta \in \Phi_{D_n}^+$ depending on $\mathrm{mul}(\gamma)$. In the last section, we apply the results in the previous sections to describe the category $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(2)}$ and the certain conditions for $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi_n^+$ such that $S_Q(\beta) \circ S_Q(\alpha) \simeq S_Q(\alpha) \circ S_Q(\beta)$ is simple.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to express his gratitude to Professor Masaki Kashiwara, Professor Kyungyong Lee and Myungho Kim for many fruitful discussions. The author gratefully acknowledge the hospitality of RIMS (Kyoto) during his visit in 2013 and 2014.

Comments for readers

In this paper, the readers encounter several cases which the author does not cover in a proof. The reason is that all of the non-covered cases can be proved in the similar way of the cases

given in the proof. If the author covers the all cases, this paper will be tedious and long than necessary.

1. Combinatorial characterization of AR-quivers of finite type D

In this section, we provide an explicit combinatorial description of AR-quivers of finite type D (see [30] for type A). To do this, we need to recall the background of Auslander-Reiten theory, Gabriel theory and various orders on Φ_n^+ briefly (see [2, 3, 5, 13] also).

1.1. **Gabriel's Theorem.** We denote by Δ_n a rank n Dynkin diagram of a finite simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_0$ with vertices $I_0 = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Let $Q = (Q_0 = I_0, Q_1)$ be a Dynkin quiver by orienting edges of Δ_n. For a given $\mathfrak{g}_0$, we denote by (i) $\Pi_n = \{\alpha_i \mid i \in I_0\}$ the set of simple roots, (ii) Φ_n (resp. Φ_n^+) the set of (resp. positive) roots (iii) W_0 the Weyl group generated by simple reflections $\{s_i \mid i \in I_0\}$ and (iv) w_0 the longest element of W_0.

It is well-known that W_0 acts on Φ_n and w_0 induces an involution on I_0, $i \mapsto i^*$, as follows:

$$w_0(\alpha_i) = -\alpha_{i^*}.$$

The finite dimensional representation $\mathtt{M}$ of the path algebra $\mathbb{C}Q$ consists of

- $\{\mathtt{M}_i \mid i \in Q_0\}$ the set of finite dimensional vector spaces labeled by Q_0 such that $\mathtt{M} = \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} \mathtt{M}_i$,
- $\{\subsetneq_{\mathsf{a}} : \mathtt{M}_{s(\mathsf{a})} \to \mathtt{M}_{t(\mathsf{a})} \mid \mathsf{a} \in Q_1\}$ the set of linear maps labeled by the set of arrows Q_1,

where $s, t : Q_1 \to Q_0$ are the *source* and *target* maps, respectively.

A *path* p of Q is a product of arrows $\mathsf{a}_1\mathsf{a}_2 \cdots \mathsf{a}_r$ such that

$$t(\mathsf{a}_k) = s(\mathsf{a}_{k+1}) \quad \text{for all } 1 \le k < r.$$

We set $s(\mathsf{p}) := s(\mathsf{a}_1)$ and $t(\mathsf{p}) := t(\mathsf{a}_r)$.

We denote by $\mathrm{Mod}\mathbb{C}Q$ the category of finite representations of the path algebra $\mathbb{C}Q$. We define the *dimension vector* $\underline{\dim}\mathtt{M}$ of $\mathtt{M}$ in $\mathrm{Mod}\mathbb{C}Q$ as follows:

$$\underline{\dim}\mathtt{M} = \sum_{i \in Q_0} \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathtt{M}_i)\alpha_i \in \sum_{i \in I_0} \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}\alpha_i.$$

Then it is known that the set of all simple modules $\mathsf{Irr}(Q)$ in $\mathrm{Mod}\mathbb{C}Q$ (up to isomorphism) can be labeled by Q_0. We write $\mathsf{Irr}(Q) := \{\mathtt{S}(i) \mid i \in Q_0\}$. Moreover, the dimension vector of $\mathtt{S}(i)$ is the same as α_i.

If Q is a Dynkin quiver of finite type A, D or E, $\mathrm{Mod}\mathbb{C}Q$ has more interesting relation with the finite simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_0$, which is known as *Gabriel's theorem*.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that Q is a Dynkin quiver of finite type A, D or E. Let us denote by $\mathsf{Ind}(Q)$ the set of all indecomposable modules in $\mathrm{Mod}\mathbb{C}Q$ (up to isomorphism). Then the map $\mathsf{Ind}(Q) \ni \mathtt{M} \mapsto \underline{\dim}\mathtt{M}$ gives a bijection between $\mathsf{Ind}(Q)$ and Φ_n^+. Thus we can write*

$$\mathsf{Ind}(Q) = \{\mathtt{M}(\beta) \mid \underline{\dim}\mathtt{M}(\beta) = \beta \in \Phi_n^+\}.$$

1.2. **Auslander-Reiten quiver.** For a vertex i of Q_0, we say that i is a *source* (resp. *sink*) if an arrow a is connected with i, then $s(\mathsf{a}) = i$ (resp. $t(\mathsf{a}) = i$). For a quiver Q and $i \in Q_0$, we define the quiver s_iQ by reversing the orientation of each arrow $\mathsf{a} \in Q_0$ with $s(\mathsf{a}) = i$ or $t(\mathsf{a}) = i$.

For the rest of this section, we assume that Q is a Dynkin quiver of finite type A, D or E.

For a reduced expression $\tilde{w} = s_{i_1}s_{i_2}\cdots s_{i_r}$ of an element $w \in W_0$, we say that it is *adapted* to Q if

$$i_k \text{ is a source of the quiver } s_{i_{k-1}}\cdots s_{i_2}s_{i_1}Q \text{ for all } 1 \le k \le r.$$

It is well-known that there exists a unique *Coxeter element* τ adapted to Q.

For a Dynkin quiver Q, we say that a map $\xi : Q \to \mathbb{Z}$ is a *height function* on Q if

$$\xi_j = \xi_i - 1 \quad \text{for } i \to j \in Q_1.$$

Since Q is connected, all pair (ξ, ξ') of height functions differ by constant. Let us fix a height function ξ.

Set

$$\mathbb{Z}Q := \{(i,p) \in \{1,2,\dots,n\} \times \mathbb{Z} \mid p - \xi_i \in 2\mathbb{Z}\}.$$

We view $\mathbb{Z}Q$ as the quiver with arrows

$$(i,p) \to (j,p+1),\ (j,q) \to (i,q+1) \ \text{ for which } i \text{ and } j \text{ are adjacent in } \Delta_n.$$

and call it the *repetition quiver* of Q. Note that $\mathbb{Z}Q$ does not depend on the orientation of the quiver Q. It is well-known that the quiver $\mathbb{Z}Q$ itself has an isomorphism with the AR-quiver of $D^b(\mathbb{C}Q)$-mod, the bounded derived category of $\mathbb{C}Q$-mod. In our convention, the injective module $\mathtt{I}(i)$ is located on the vertex (i, ξ_i) of $\mathbb{Z}Q$.

For a vertex $i \in Q_0$, we define positive roots η_i and ζ_i defined as follows:

$$\eta_i := \sum_{j \in B(i)} \alpha_j \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_i := \sum_{j \in C(i)} \alpha_j, \tag{1.1}$$

where $B(i)$ (resp. $C(i)$) is the set of vertices $j \in Q_0$ such that there exists a path p in Q with $s(\mathsf{p}) = j$ and $t(\mathsf{p}) = i$ (resp. $s(\mathsf{p}) = i$ and $t(\mathsf{p}) = j$).

Definition 1.2. [17, §6.4] We call a positive root $\beta = \sum_{i \in I_0} n_i\alpha_i$ *multiplicity free* if $n_i \le 1$ for all $i \in I_0$.

By (1.1) and Definition 1.2, we have

$$\text{all } \eta_i \text{ and } \zeta_i \ (i \in I_0) \text{ are multiplicity free positive roots.} \tag{1.2}$$

Set $\widehat{\Phi}_n^+ := \Phi_n^+ \times \mathbb{Z}$. The bijection $\widehat{\phi} : \mathbb{Z}Q \to \widehat{\Phi}_n^+$ defined by $\mathtt{M}(\beta)[m] \mapsto (\beta, m)$ can be described in the following combinatorial way([18, §2.2]):

(i) $\widehat{\phi}(i, \xi_i) = (\eta_i, 0)$,

(ii) For a given $\widehat{\phi}(i,p) = (\beta, m)$,
$$\begin{cases} \widehat{\phi}(i, p-2) = (\tau(\beta), m) & \text{if } \tau(\beta) \in \Phi_n^+, \\ \widehat{\phi}(i, p-2) = (-\tau(\beta), m-1) & \text{if } \tau(\beta) \in \Phi_n^-, \\ \widehat{\phi}(i, p+2) = (\tau^{-1}(\beta), m) & \text{if } \tau^{-1}(\beta) \in \Phi_n^+, \\ \widehat{\phi}(i, p+2) = (-\tau^{-1}(\beta), m+1) & \text{if } \tau^{-1}(\beta) \in \Phi_n^-. \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

We write the injection $\widehat{\phi}^{-1}|_{\Phi_n^+ \times 0}$ as ϕ^{-1}.

Definition 1.3. The *Auslander-Reiten quiver* $\Gamma_Q = ((\Gamma_Q)_0, (\Gamma_Q)_1)$ is the full subquiver of $\mathbb{Z}Q$ whose set of vertices is the same as $\phi^{-1}(\Phi_n^+) := \widehat{\phi}^{-1}(\Phi_n^+, 0)$. Thus one can identify $(\Gamma_Q)_0$ with Φ_n^+.

Considering Theorem 1.1, the following facts are known:

(a) The vertices $\beta \in (\Gamma_Q)_0$ corresponds to $\mathtt{M}(\beta)$ in $\mathsf{Ind}(Q)$.
(b) The arrow $\beta \to \beta' \in (\Gamma_Q)_1$ corresponds to the *irreducible morphism* from $\mathtt{M}(\beta)$ to $\mathtt{M}(\beta')$.

In particular, the projective cover $\mathtt{P}(i)$ of $\mathtt{S}(i)$ corresponds to η_i, and the injective envelope $\mathtt{I}(i)$ of $\mathtt{S}(i)$ corresponds to ζ_{i^*}.

For $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$ with $\tau(\beta) \in \Phi_n^+$, the following property holds:

$$\beta + \tau(\beta) = \sum_{\theta \in X(\beta)} \theta \tag{1.4}$$

where $X(\beta)$ denote the set of positive roots θ such that there exists an arrow $\theta \to \beta$ in $(\Gamma_Q)_1$.

For $i \in Q_0$, we define

$$m_i = \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid \tau^k(\eta_i) \in \Phi_n^+\}. \tag{1.5}$$

Then the AR-quiver Γ_Q satisfies the following properties:

$$(\Gamma_Q)_0 = \{(i,p) \in \mathbb{Z}Q \mid \xi_i - 2m_i \leq p \leq \xi_i\}, \tag{1.6}$$

$$\xi_{i^*} - 2m_{i^*} = \xi_i - \mathtt{h}_n + 2. \tag{1.7}$$

Here $\mathtt{h}_n$ denotes the Coxeter number of $\mathfrak{g}_0$.

1.3. **Orders on Φ_n^+.** In this subsection, we shall recall various orders on Φ_n^+.

We say that an order $<$ on Φ_n^+ is *convex* if the order satisfies the following property:

For all α, β and $\gamma = \alpha + \beta \in \Phi_n^+$, either $\alpha < \gamma < \beta$ or $\beta < \gamma < \alpha$.

It is well-known that a reduced expression $\widetilde{w}_0$ of w_0 induces a *convex total order* $<_{\widetilde{w}_0}$ on Φ_n^+ as follows ([5]):

$$\beta_z := s_{i_1}s_{i_2}\cdots s_{i_{z-1}}\alpha_{i_z} \text{ and } \beta_x <_{\widetilde{w}_0} \beta_y \text{ if and only if } x < y.$$

Moreover, any convex total order is induced by a reduced expression $\widetilde{w}_0$ of w_0 ([31]).

We say that two reduced expressions $\widetilde{w} = s_{i_1}s_{i_2}\cdots s_{i_{\ell(w)}}$ and $\widetilde{w}' = s_{j_1}s_{j_2}\cdots s_{j_{\ell(w)}}$ of $w \in W_0$ are *commutation equivalent*, denoted by $\widetilde{w} \sim \widetilde{w}' \in [\widetilde{w}]$, if $s_{j_1}s_{j_2}\cdots s_{j_{\ell(w)}}$ is obtained from $s_{i_1}s_{i_2}\cdots s_{i_{\ell(w)}}$ by replacing s_as_b by s_bs_a for a and b not linked in Δ_n (see [4])

For a reduced expression $\widetilde{w}_0$ of w_0 adapted to Q, the following is well-known:

(1.8) If $\widetilde{w}_0' \in [\widetilde{w}_0]$, then $\widetilde{w}_0'$ is adapted to Q. Conversely, any $\widetilde{w}_0'$ adapted to Q is in $[\widetilde{w}_0]$.

Thus we can write $[Q] := [\widetilde{w}_0]$ for the $\widetilde{w}_0$.

Note that a commutation class $[w_0]$ of w_0 determines the *coarsest* convex partial order $\prec_{[\widetilde{w}_0]}$ on Φ_n^+. In particular, the order $\prec_Q := \prec_{[Q]}$ is defined by the paths in Γ_Q ([4, 32]). More precisely,

(1.9)
- for a pair $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Phi_n^+$ with $\gamma = \alpha + \beta \in \Phi_n^+$ and $\widetilde{w}_0 \sim \widetilde{w}_0'$, then we have
$$\alpha <_{\widetilde{w}_0} \gamma <_{\widetilde{w}_0} \beta \quad \text{ if and only if } \quad \alpha <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} \gamma <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} \beta,$$
- $\alpha \prec_Q \beta$ if and only if there exist paths from β to α in Γ_Q.

The following theorem provides a way of obtaining all reduced expressions of w_0 in $[Q]$ and hence convex total orders compatible with the convex partial order $\preceq_Q$:

(1.10) $$\alpha \prec_Q \beta \text{ implies } \alpha <_{\widetilde{w}_0} \beta \text{ for any } \widetilde{w}_0 \in [Q].$$

Theorem 1.4. [4, Theorem 2.17] *Any reduced expression in the equivalence class $[Q]$ can be obtained by reading Γ_Q in the following way: If there exists an arrow $\beta \to \alpha \in (\Gamma_Q)_1$, we read α before β. Replacing vertex β by i for $\phi^{-1}(\beta) = (i, p)$, we have a sequence $(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{\mathsf{N}})$ giving a reduced expression of w_0 adapted to Q,*

$$w_0 = s_{i_1}s_{i_2}\cdots s_{i_{\mathsf{N}}}.$$

Remark 1.5. We fix Q as the Dynkin quiver associated to type D_n ($n \geq 4$). In this remark, we give four canonical readings of Γ_Q which are compatible with Theorem 1.4. Thus we have four convex total orders on Φ_n^+ which are compatible with the convex partial order $\preceq_Q$:

(A) $<_Q^{U,1}$ (resp. $<_Q^{U,2}$) is the convex total order induced from the following reading:

$$\text{we read } (i,p) \text{ before } (i',p') \iff \begin{cases} d(1,i) - p > d(1,i') - p' \text{ or} \\ d(1,i) - p = d(1,i') - p' \text{ and } d(1,i) > d(1,i'), \text{ or} \\ d(1,i) - p = d(1,i') - p',\ d(1,i) = d(1,i') \text{ and } i > i' \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (\text{resp } i < i'). \end{cases}$$

(B) $<_Q^{L,1}$ (resp. $<_Q^{L,2}$) is the convex total order induced from the following reading:

$$\text{we read } (i,p) \text{ before } (i',p') \iff \begin{cases} d(1,i)+p < d(1,i')+p' \text{ or} \\ d(1,i)+p = d(1,i')+p' \text{ and } d(1,i) < d(1,i'), \text{ or} \\ d(1,i)+p = d(1,i')+p',\ d(1,i) = d(1,i') \text{ and } i > i' \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (\text{resp } i < i'). \end{cases}$$

Here, $d(i,j)$ denotes the distance between i and j in Δ_n. Note that there are many other readings which are compatible with Theorem 1.4.

Definition 1.6. [27, §2.1]. Let $<$ be any total order on Φ_n^+ (need not convex). We say pair (α,β) with $\alpha<\beta$ and $\gamma=\alpha+\beta\in\Phi_n^+$ *minimal with respect to* $<$ if there exists *no* pair (α',β') such that $\gamma=\alpha'+\beta'$ and $\alpha<\alpha'<\gamma<\beta'<\beta$.

Remark 1.7. For every convex total order which is compatible with $\preceq_Q$, a pair (α,β) of $\alpha+\beta=\gamma\in\Phi_n^+$ can *not* be a minimal pair of γ if there exists another pair (α',β') such that

$$\alpha'+\beta'=\gamma \text{ and there exist paths from } \beta \text{ to } \beta' \text{ and } \alpha' \text{ to } \alpha.$$

1.4. **Characterization of Auslander-Reiten quiver of finite type D.** The combinatorial properties in this subsection might be known to the experts through their computations on Γ_Q of finite type D. More precisely, using a fixed quiver, the *reflection functor* on $D^b(\mathbb{C}Q)$-mod and the tilting theorem ([3, Chapter VII]), one can observe the descriptions in this subsection. However, we have a difficulty for finding in standard textbooks and need an explicit description for the later use. Thus we shall derive the properties from Lemma 1.11 below and the contents in §1.2.

For the rest of this section, Δ_n means the Dynkin diagram of finite type D with the following enumeration:



for $n\geq 4$.

The Coxeter number $\mathtt{h}_n$ is $2n-2$ and the involution * induced by $w_0\in W_0$ is given by $i^*=i$ for $1\leq i\leq n-2$ and $(n-1)^*=n-1$, $n^*=n$ if n is even, $(n-1)^*=n$, $n^*=n-1$ if n is odd. Note that

$$|\xi_{n-1}-\xi_n| = 2 \text{ or } 0. \tag{1.11}$$

Thus (1.7) and (1.11) tell that

$$m_i = n-2 \text{ for } 1\leq i\leq n-2 \text{ and } m_{n-1}+m_n = 2n-4 \quad \text{with } m_{n-1}, m_n \geq n-3. \tag{1.12}$$

We say that $b \in \{2, \cdots, n-2\}$ is a right intermediate (resp. a left intermediate) if



in the Dynkin quiver Q.

Note that every positive root $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$ can be written in the following form:

$$\beta = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j = \sum_{i \le k < j} \alpha_k & (1 \le i < j \le n), \\ \varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_n = \sum_{i \le k \le n-2} \alpha_k + \alpha_n & (1 \le i < n), \\ \varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_j = \sum_{i \le k < j} \alpha_k + 2\sum_{j \le k \le n-2} \alpha_k + \alpha_{n-1} + \alpha_n & (1 \le i < j < n), \end{cases}$$

where $(\varepsilon_a, \varepsilon_b) = \delta_{a,b}$. Thus one can identify $\beta \in \Phi_n^+ = (\Gamma_Q)_0$ with $\{a, \pm b\}$ (see [5, PLATE IV]). For $\beta = \{a, \pm b\} \in \Phi_n^+$, we call ε_a and $\pm\varepsilon_b$ *summands* of β.

Definition 1.8. For an integer $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 1}$ and a positive root β, we define $k \ge$*-support of* β, denoted by $\mathrm{Supp}_{\ge k}(\beta)$, in the following way:

$$\mathrm{Supp}_{\ge k}(\beta) := \{i \in I \mid n_i \ge k\} \quad \text{where } \beta = \sum_{i \in I} n_i \alpha_i.$$

Example 1.9. Let the quiver  of finite type D_4 and a height function ξ with $\xi_3 = 0$ be given. Then Γ_Q can be drawn by using (1.3), or the additive property of dimension vectors (1.4) as follows:



For $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$ with $\phi^{-1}(\beta) = (i, p)$, we denote by $\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) = i$ (call it *level* of β), and $\phi_2^{-1}(\beta) = p$.

Definition 1.10.

(a) A connected subquiver ρ of Γ_Q is an *S-sectional path* if ρ is a concatenation of arrows whose forms are $(i, p) \to (i+1, p+1)$ for $1 \le i \le n-2$, or $(n-2, p) \to (n, p+1)$.

(b) A connected subquiver ρ of Γ_Q is an *N-sectional path* if ρ is a concatenation of arrows whose forms are $(i, p) \to (i-1, p+1)$ for $2 \le i \le n-1$, or $(n, p) \to (n-2, p+1)$.

(c) A positive root $\beta \in \Phi^+$ is *contained in the subquiver* ρ in Γ_Q if β is an end or a start of some arrow in the subquiver ρ.

(d) An S-sectional (resp. N-sectional) path ρ is *maximal* if there is no bigger S-sectional (resp. N-sectional) path containing all positive roots in ρ.

(e) A connected subquiver ϱ in Γ_Q is called a *swing* if it consists of vertices and arrows in the following way: There exist roots $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi^+$ and $r, s \leq n-2$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} & & & & & & \beta & & & & \\ S_r & \to & S_{r+1} & \to & \cdots & \to & S_{n-2} & & N_{n-2} & \to & N_{n-3} \to \cdots \to N_s \\ & & & & & & \alpha & & & & \end{array} \quad \text{where}$$

- $\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & & & \beta \\ S_r & \to & S_{r+1} & \to & \cdots & \to & S_{n-2} \\ & & & & & & \alpha \end{array}$ is an S-sectional path $(\phi_1^{-1}(S_l) = l)$,
- $\begin{array}{ccccc} \beta & & & & \\ & \searrow & & & \\ & & N_{n-2} & \to \cdots \to & N_s \\ & \nearrow & & & \\ \alpha & & & & \end{array}$ is an N-sectional path $(\phi_1^{-1}(N_l) = l)$,
- β is located at $(n-1, u)$ and α is located at (n, u) for some $u \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(f) A swing ϱ is *maximal* if there is no bigger swing containing all positive roots in ϱ.

Lemma 1.11. [4, Lemma 2.11],[22, §3.2]

(a) *Let $k \in I_0$ be a source, sink, left intermediate or right intermediate in Q. Then we have*

$$\phi^{-1}(\alpha_k) = \begin{cases} (k, \xi_k) & \text{if } k \text{ is a source,} \\ (k^*, \xi_{k^*} - 2m_{k^*}) & \text{if } k \text{ is a sink,} \\ (1, \xi_k - k + 1) & \text{if } k \text{ is a left intermediate,} \\ (1, \xi_k - 2n + k + 3) & \text{if } k \text{ is a right intermediate.} \end{cases}$$

(b) *Assume that $n-2$ is neither a source, sink, left intermediate nor right intermediate in Q. For $\{a, b\} = \{n-1, n\}$, we have*

$$\phi^{-1}(\alpha_{n-2}) = \begin{cases} (a^*, \xi_{n-2} - 2n + 5) & \text{if } \begin{array}{ccccc} \bullet & \to & \bullet & & a \\ n-3 & & n-2 & \searrow & \bullet \\ & & & & b \end{array}, \\ (a, \xi_{n-2} - 1) & \text{if } \begin{array}{ccccc} \bullet & \leftarrow & \bullet & & a \\ n-3 & & n-2 & \searrow & \bullet \\ & & & & b \end{array}. \end{cases}$$

(c) *If $\beta \to \alpha \in (\Gamma_Q)_1$, then $(\alpha, \beta) = 1$.*

(d) *For all $i, j \in I_0$,*

$$(i, \xi_j - d(i,j)),\ (i, \xi_j - 2m_j + d(i,j)) \in \Gamma. \tag{1.13}$$

Proof. The proofs are similar with the ones in [30, Lemma 1.7]. □

The following lemma comes from (1.7), (1.12) and the involution * on I_0:

Lemma 1.12. *We have the m_{n-1} and m_n in* (1.5) *as follows:*

$$\begin{cases} m_{n-1} = n-3,\ m_n = n-1 & \text{if } n \equiv 1 \pmod 2 \text{ and } \xi_n = \xi_{n-1} + 2, \\ m_{n-1} = n-1,\ m_n = n-3 & \text{if } n \equiv 1 \pmod 2 \text{ and } \xi_{n-1} = \xi_n + 2, \\ m_{n-1} = m_n = n-2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 1.13. *For $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi^+$ with $\phi^{-1}(\alpha) = (n-1, k)$ and $\phi^{-1}(\beta) = (n, k)$, there exists $1 \le a \le n-1$ such that*

$$\alpha + \beta = 2\varepsilon_a \quad \text{and} \quad \{\alpha, \beta\} = \begin{cases} \{\{a, n\}, \{a, -n\}\} & \text{if } \xi_n - \xi_{n-1} = 0, \\ \{\{a, n-1\}, \{a, -n+1\}\} & \text{if } \xi_n - \xi_{n-1} = \pm 2. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if $\phi^{-1}(\alpha') = (n-1, k \pm 1), \phi^{-1}(\beta') = (n, k \pm 1) \in \Phi_n^+$, then we have

$$\alpha + \alpha' \in \Phi_n^+ \text{ and } \beta + \beta' \in \Phi_n^+. \tag{1.14}$$

Proof. **(Case a: when $\xi_n - \xi_{n-1} = 0$)** In this case, $\{n-1, n\}$ are both sources or sinks. Assume that they are sinks and n is odd. By Lemma 1.11 (a) and Lemma 1.12, the situation can be described as follows:



By (1.4), we have $\varepsilon_{n-1} + \varepsilon_n + \theta_1 = \lambda_1 = \varepsilon_{n-1} - \varepsilon_n + \gamma_1$ and hence $\gamma_1 - \theta_1 = 2\varepsilon_n$. Thus

$$\gamma_1 = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_n \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_1 = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_n \quad \text{for some} \quad a \le n-2.$$

Using this argument successively, we can obtain our first assertion. The second assertion follows from the additive property of dimension vectors (1.4). The remaining cases can be proved in the similar way.

(Case b: when $\xi_n - \xi_{n-1} = \pm 2$) In this case, one of $n-1$ and n is a sink and the another is a source. Assume that n is a sink and n is odd. Then the neighborhood of $n-2$ in Q can be drawn as follows:



for some $a \le n-2$.

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(n-2) &= (\alpha_a + \cdots + \alpha_{n-3}) + \alpha_{n-2} + \alpha_n = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_n, \\ \underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(n-1) &= (\alpha_a + \cdots + \alpha_{n-3}) + \alpha_{n-2} + \alpha_{n-1} + \alpha_n = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_{n-1}, \\ \underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(n) &= \alpha_n = \varepsilon_{n-1} + \varepsilon_n,\ \underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(n-1) = \alpha_{n-1} = \varepsilon_{n-1} - \varepsilon_n. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1.11 (a), the situation can be described as follows:



Thus $\theta_1 = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_{n-1}$ by the additive property on dimension vectors. Using the arguments in **(Case a)**, one can easily verify our assertions. The remaining cases can be proved in the similar way. □

Throughout this paper, we denote by $\mathtt{t} \in \{n-1, n\}$ which is determined in Lemma 1.13 and t' the element in $\{n-1, n\} \setminus \{\mathtt{t}\}$; i.e.,

$$\mathtt{t} := \begin{cases} n-1 \\ n \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathtt{t}' := \begin{cases} n & \text{if } \xi_{n-1} - \xi_n = \pm 2, \\ n-1 & \text{if } \xi_{n-1} - \xi_n = 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.15}$$

By Lemma 1.13, we can notice that all roots containing $\pm\varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}$ as their summand appear in the level $n-1$ and n.

Lemma 1.14.

(a) *Let $k \leq n-2$ be a source in Q and ρ be the maximal N-sectional path containing the simple root α_k. Then all roots in ρ contain ε_k as their summand and ρ can be drawn as follows:*

$$\begin{matrix} \varepsilon_k \pm \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}} \\ \\ \varepsilon_k \mp \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}} \end{matrix} \searrow\!\nearrow N_{n-2} \longrightarrow N_{n-3} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow N_k = \alpha_k, \quad \text{where } \phi_1^{-1}(N_l) = l.$$

(b) *Let $k \leq n-2$ be a sink in Q and ρ be the maximal S-sectional path containing the simple root α_k. Then all roots in ρ contain ε_k as their summand and ρ can be drawn as follows:*

$$\alpha_k = S_k \longrightarrow S_{k+1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow S_{n-2} \begin{matrix} \nearrow \varepsilon_k \pm \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}} \\ \\ \searrow \varepsilon_k \mp \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}} \end{matrix}, \quad \text{where } \phi_1^{-1}(S_l) = l.$$

Proof. Assume that k is a source. Then the neighborhood of k in Q can be drawn as



For $a \le k-1$ with a path from a to $k-1$ in Q, denoted by $a \xrightarrow{\text{path}} k-1$, we have

$$\underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(k-1) = \alpha_a + \cdots + \alpha_k = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_{k+1} \qquad \text{if } k-1 \text{ exists},$$

$$\underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(k+1) = \begin{cases} \text{(i) } \alpha_k + \cdots + \alpha_b = \varepsilon_k - \varepsilon_{b+1} \\ \quad \text{if } {}^{\exists}b \to b+1 \ (b \le k+1 < n-2) \text{ and } {}^{\exists}k+1 \xleftarrow{\text{path}} b \text{ in } Q, \\ \text{(ii) } \alpha_k + \cdots + \alpha_{n-2} + \alpha_n = \varepsilon_k + \varepsilon_n \\ \qquad \text{if } {}^{\exists}\ k+1 \xleftarrow{\text{path}} n \text{ and } {}^{\nexists}\ k+1 \xleftarrow{\text{path}} n-1 \text{ in } Q, \\ \text{(iii) } \alpha_k + \cdots + \alpha_{n-2} + \alpha_{n-1} = \varepsilon_k - \varepsilon_n \\ \qquad \text{if } {}^{\exists}\ k+1 \xleftarrow{\text{path}} n-1 \text{ and } {}^{\nexists}\ k+1 \xleftarrow{\text{path}} n \text{ in } Q, \\ \text{(iv) } \alpha_k + \cdots + \alpha_{n-2} + \alpha_{n-1} = \varepsilon_k + \varepsilon_{n-1} \\ \qquad \text{if } {}^{\exists}\ k+1 \xleftarrow{\text{path}} n-1 \text{ and } {}^{\exists}\ k+1 \xleftarrow{\text{path}} n \text{ in } Q, \end{cases}$$

$$\underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(k) = \alpha_k = \varepsilon_{k-1} - \varepsilon_k.$$

By Lemma 1.11 (d), the following subquiver is contained in Γ_Q:

(1.16)



Note that $C_1 = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_{b+1}$, $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_n$, $\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_n$ or $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_{n-1}$ corresponding to (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv), respectively.

From the subquiver (1.16), the additive property of dimension vectors (1.4) tells that

- $C_0 - \alpha_k = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_k = C_1 - M_1 = \cdots = C_{n-k-1} - M_{n-k-1}$,
- $C_{n-k-1} + M_{n-k} + M'_{n-k} = C_{n-k} + M_{n-k-1}$,
- $C_{n-k} = C_{n-k-1} + M_{n-k} = C'_{n-k-1} + M'_{n-k}$.

Hence we conclude that $\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_k = C_{n-k+1} - M'_{n-k} = C'_{n-k+1} - M_{n-k}$. By Lemma 1.13, we can conclude that M_{n-k} and M'_{n-k} contain ε_k as their summand.

On the other hand, $\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_k + M_2 = C_2$ and hence

$$M_2 = \varepsilon'_a - \varepsilon_a \quad \text{ or } \quad \varepsilon_k \pm \varepsilon_c \quad \text{for some } a' < a < c.$$

By Lemma 1.11 (c), M_2 should be of the form $\varepsilon_k \pm \varepsilon_c$. In this way, we can conclude that M_i for $2 \le i \le n-k-1$ contain ε_k as their summand, which yields our first assertion. For the case when k is a sink, we can apply the similar argument by observing $\underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}((k-1)^*)$, $\underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(k^*)$ and $\underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}((k+1)^*)$. □

Proposition 1.15. *Let $\phi^{-1}(\alpha) = (n', s)$ and $\phi^{-1}(\beta) = (n'', l)$ such that*

$$n', n'' \in \{n-1, n\}, \quad |s-l| = 2k \quad \text{and} \quad n' - n'' \equiv k-1 \pmod 2,$$

for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Then we have

$$\phi^{-1}(\alpha+\beta) = (n-1-k, \frac{s+l}{2}) \in \Gamma_Q.$$

Proof. Consider the subquiver $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ of $\mathbb{Z}Q$ with setting $\alpha = \theta_1$ or γ_1, and $\beta = \theta_{k+1}$ or γ_{k+1}:
(1.17)



If $k = 1$, it is trivial. Assume that $k > 1$ and k is even. By (1.6) and an induction on k,

$$A[k-2]_2 = \theta_2 + \theta_k = \gamma_2 + \gamma_k \in \Phi_n^+,$$
$$A[k-1]_1 = \theta_1 + \gamma_k = \gamma_1 + \theta_k \in \Phi_n^+,$$
$$A[k-1]_2 = \theta_2 + \gamma_{k+1} = \gamma_2 + \theta_{k+1} \in \Phi_n^+.$$

Thus all $A[i]_j \in \widetilde{\Gamma}$ $(i < k)$ are elements in Φ_n^+ and

$$A[k]_1 = A[k-1]_1 + A[k-1]_2 - A[k-2]_2 = \theta_1 + \theta_{k+1} = \gamma_1 + \gamma_{k+1} \in \Phi_n^+$$

by (1.14). For the case when k is odd, one can prove in the similar way. □

For $\beta = \sum_{i \in I} k_i \alpha_i \in \Phi_n^+$, the *height* of β is defined by $\mathrm{ht}(\beta) = \sum_{i \in I} k_i$.

Corollary 1.16. *Set*

$$i = \max\{\phi_2^{-1}(\beta) \mid \ \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) \in \{n-1, n\},\ \mathrm{ht}(\beta) \geq 2\},$$
$$j = \min\{\phi_2^{-1}(\beta) \mid \ \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) \in \{n-1, n\},\ \mathrm{ht}(\beta) \geq 2\}.$$

Then we have the followings:

(a) $i - j = 2(n-3)$.

(b) *Every multiplicity non-free positive root β satisfies the following conditions:*

$$1 < \ell := \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) < n-1 \text{ and } j - (n-1-\ell) \leq \phi_2^{-1}(\beta) \leq i - (n-1-\ell). \tag{1.18}$$

Proof. Note that the number of multiplicity non-free positive roots is $(n-3)(n-2)/2$. By Lemma 1.13, a simple root α with $\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) \in \{n-1, n\}$ is α_{n-2}, α_{n-1} or α_n. Then the first assertion follows from Lemma 1.11 (a) and Lemma 1.12. For each multiplicity non-free positive root $\beta = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b$ $(b \leq n-2)$, there exist two pairs of roots $\{\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}, \varepsilon_b + \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}\}$ and $\{\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}, \varepsilon_b - \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}\}$

such that their sums are β and they are located at level $n-1$ or n. By setting $k = n-3$, $\phi_2^{-1}(a_1) = j$ and $\phi_2^{-1}(a_{n-2}) = i$ in (1.17), our second assertion follows. □

Corollary 1.17. *Assume we have two roots α and β in the same sectional path such that α is multiplicity free located in the level $k < n-1$ and β is not multiplicity free. Then*

$$\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) < \phi_1^{-1}(\beta).$$

Proof. Recall that β is contained in the area (1.18) and α is not. Thus our assertion follows. □

Corollary 1.18. (a) *Assume that $\xi_n = \xi_{n-1}$. Then there exists the maximal sectional path ρ which can be drawn as follows:*

(1.19)
$$\begin{cases} \begin{array}{ccccccc} \alpha_{n-1} & & & & & & \\ & \searrow & & & & & \\ & & N_{n-2} & \longrightarrow & N_{n-3} & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & N_1 \\ & \nearrow & & & & & \\ \alpha_n & & & & & & \end{array} & \text{if } \{n-1, n\} \text{ are sinks,} \\ \begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & & & \alpha_{n-1} \\ & & & & & \nearrow & \\ S_1 & \longrightarrow & S_2 & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & S_{n-2} & & \\ & & & & & \searrow & \\ & & & & & & \alpha_n \end{array} & \text{if } \{n-1, n\} \text{ are sources.} \end{cases}$$

Here all roots in ρ contain ε_{n-1} as their summand and $\phi_1^{-1}(S_l) = \phi_1^{-1}(N_l) = l$ $(1 \le l \le k-2)$.

(b) *Assume that $|\xi_n - \xi_{n-1}| = 2$. Then there exists the maximal sectional pathes ρ and ρ' which can be drawn as follows:*

(1.20)
$$\begin{cases} \overbrace{\alpha_{n-1} \to N_{n-2} \to \cdots N_2 \to N_1}^{\rho = \text{maximal } N\text{-sectional path}} \cdots \underbrace{S_1 \to S_2 \to \cdots \to S_{n-2} \to \alpha_n}_{\rho' = \text{maximal } S\text{-sectional path}} & \text{if } \xi_n - \xi_{n-1} = 2, \\ \overbrace{\alpha_n \to N_{n-2} \to \cdots N_2 \to N_1}^{\rho = \text{maximal } N\text{-sectional path}} \cdots \underbrace{S_1 \to S_2 \to \cdots \to S_{n-2} \to \alpha_{n-1}}_{\rho' = \text{maximal } S\text{-sectional path}} & \text{if } \xi_{n-1} - \xi_n = 2, \end{cases}$$

where

- $\phi_1^{-1}(S_l) = \phi_1^{-1}(N_l) = l$ $(1 \le l \le k-2)$,
- $\phi_2^{-1}(N_1) + 2 = \phi_2^{-1}(S_1)$,
- *N_l contains ε_n as its summand and S_l contains $-\varepsilon_n$ as its summand* $(1 \le l \le k-2)$.

Proof. We only give a proof when $\{n-1, n\}$ are sinks. The remaining cases can be proved using the argument in this proof. By Lemma 1.11, Lemma 1.12 and Proposition 1.15, we know

that there is a subquiver in Γ_Q as follows:



where $\{a_k, b_k\} = \{\varepsilon_{i_k} - \varepsilon_n, \varepsilon_{i_k} + \varepsilon_n\}$ for some $i_k \leq n-2$. By Corollary 1.18,

$$A[\ell]_1 = \alpha_{n-1} + (\varepsilon_{i_{\ell+1}} + \varepsilon_n) = \alpha_n + (\varepsilon_{i_{\ell+1}} - \varepsilon_n) = \varepsilon_{i_{\ell+1}} + \varepsilon_{n-1} \quad (1 \leq \ell \leq n-2),$$

which yields our assertion. □

Proposition 1.19.

(a) *For every maximal S-sectional path ρ which ends at level n and $n-1$, there exists $k \leq n-2+\delta$ such that all roots in ρ contain ε_k as their summand. Here $\delta = 1$ if $\{n-1, n\}$ are sources, and $\delta = 0$ otherwise.*

(b) *For every maximal N-sectional path ρ which starts at level n and $n-1$, there exists $k \leq n-2+\delta$ such that all roots in ρ contain ε_k as their summand. Here $\delta = 1$ if $\{n-1, n\}$ are sinks, and $\delta = 0$ otherwise.*

Proof. We only give a proof for the first assertion. Take a subset E of $\{1, 2, \cdots, n-2\}$ defined as follows:

$$a \in E \iff \xi_a = \min\{\xi_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n-2\}.$$

Note that maximal S-sectional paths ending at $n-1$ and n are adjacent to each other.

(Case A: $n-2 \neq a \in E$ **)** Then we can check that a is a sink in Q. By Lemma 1.14, the maximal S-sectional path ρ_a containing α_a satisfies our assertion.

Let ρ be a maximal S-sectional path which ends at level n and $n-1$, and is located at the right of ρ_a. By an induction on the distance from ρ_a, all roots in the maximal S-sectional path left adjacent to ρ contain ε_b as their summand. Thus, by Lemma 1.13, the situation in Γ_Q can be drawn as follows:



where $1 \leq k \leq n-2$ and all S_i contain ε_b as their summand. Since $|\xi_j - \xi_{j\pm1}| = 1$ for all $j \in I$, we can see that all M_i contain ε_k as their summand by the additive property of dimension

vectors.

(Case B: $\{n-2\} = E$ **)** If $n-2$ is a sink, then we can apply the same argument in **(Case A)**. Assume that $n-2$ is not a sink. By our choice, we have the following subquiver $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ in $\mathbb{Z}Q$



where α or β in Φ_n^+, and $1 \le k \le n-2$. By the additive property of dimension vectors, $\underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(n-2)$ contains ε_k as its summand. Thus all roots in the maximal S-sectional path containing $\underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(n-2)$



contain ε_k as their summand. Thus we can apply the same argument in **(Case A)** also. □

Theorem 1.20. *For every maximal swing ϱ, there exists $1 \le k \le n-2$ such that all roots in ϱ contain ε_k as their summand. Moreover, ϱ contains a simple root α_k and is one of the following two forms:*

$$\underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(k) = S_k \longrightarrow S_{k+1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow S_{n-2} \begin{array}{c} \nearrow \\ \searrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \varepsilon_k \pm \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}} \\ \varepsilon_k \mp \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}} \end{array} N_{n-2} \longrightarrow N_{n-3} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow N_1 \ , \tag{1.21}$$

$$S_1 \longrightarrow S_2 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow S_{n-2} \begin{array}{c} \nearrow \\ \searrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \varepsilon_k \pm \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}} \\ \varepsilon_k \mp \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}} \end{array} N_{n-2} \longrightarrow N_{n-3} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow N_k = \underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(k) \ . \tag{1.22}$$

Proof. By Lemma 1.13 and Proposition 1.19, every maximal swing is of the following form

$$S_r \longrightarrow S_{r+1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow S_{n-2} \begin{array}{c} \nearrow \\ \searrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \varepsilon_k - \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}} \\ \varepsilon_k + \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}} \end{array} N_{n-2} \longrightarrow N_{n-3} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow N_s$$

where $k \le n-2$ and all S_i $(1 \le u \le r)$ and N_j $(1 \le v \le s)$ contain ε_k as their summand.

(**Case A:** k is a source or sink) Assume that k is a source in Q, then $\alpha_k = N_1$ or S_1. We claim that $\alpha_k = N_1$. By Lemma 1.11, $\phi_2^{-1}(\varepsilon_k \pm \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}) = \xi_k - n + 1 - k$ or $\xi_k + n - 1 + k$. However, the later case can not be happen since $\xi_n < \xi_k + n - 1 + k$ by the assumption that k is a source in Q. Thus Proposition 1.14 implies that $\alpha_k = N_1$ and hence $\phi_2^{-1}(\varepsilon_k \pm \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}) = \xi_k - n + 1 - k$. Since $\xi_1 - 2n + 4 \le \xi_k - 2n + 3 + k$, our assertion for a source k follows and the maximal swing is of the form (1.22). In the similar way, we have our assertion for a sink k and the maximal swing is of the form (1.21).

(**Case B:** k is a left or right intermediate) Assume that k is a left intermediate in Q. Then Lemma 1.11 and Proposition 1.19 tell that $\alpha_k = N_1$ or S_1. By Lemma 1.11 once again, $\phi_2^{-1}(\varepsilon_k \pm \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}) = \xi_k - k + 1 - (n-2)$ or $\xi_k - k + 1 + (n-2)$. Since k is a left intermediate, $\xi_{n-1} < \xi_k + (n-1-k)$ and hence $\alpha_k = N_1$ and $\phi_2^{-1}(\varepsilon_k \pm \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}) = \xi_k - k - n + 3$. Note that

$$\xi_k - k - n + 3 - (n-1-k) = \xi_k - 2n + 4 = \xi_k - 2m_k.$$

Since k is a left intermediate, $(k-1, \xi_k - 2m_k - 1) \notin \Gamma_Q$. Thus our assertion for a left intermediate k follows and the maximal swing is of the form (1.21). In the similar way, we have our assertion for a right intermediate k and the maximal swing is of the form (1.22).

(**Case C:** remaining cases) For the remaining cases, we can apply the similar argument in **Case A** and **Case B** with Lemma 1.11 (b). Thus one can prove that

- if 

, then the maximal swing is of the form (1.21),
- if 

, then the maximal swing is of the form (1.22).

Here $\{a, b\} = \{n-1, n\}$. □

Remark 1.21. Note that, for each $1 \le a \le n-2$, there are $2n-a-1$ positive roots containing ε_a as their summand. Thus Theorem 1.20 implies that every root is contained in a maximal swing. With Corollary 1.18, we can say that a maximal swing ϱ is the *a-swing* if all positive roots having ε_a as their summand appear in ϱ.

Definition 1.22. For the a-swing

$$S_s \longrightarrow S_{s+1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow S_{n-2} \begin{array}{c} \nearrow \\ \searrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \varepsilon_a \pm \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}} \\ \\ \varepsilon_a \mp \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \searrow \\ \nearrow \end{array} N_{n-2} \longrightarrow N_{n-3} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow N_l$$

we define

(1) *the S-part* as $S_s \to S_{s+1} \to \cdots \to S_{n-2}$ and *a length of the S-part* as $n-2-s$,
(2) *the N-part* as $N_{n-2} \to N_{n-3} \to \cdots \to N_l$ and *a length of the N-part* as $n-2-l$,
(3) the shorter part (resp. longer part) in a canonical way.

We say that a maximal S-sectional (resp. N-sectional) path is *shallow* if it ends (resp. starts) at level less than $n-1$.

Theorem 1.23. *Let ρ be a shallow maximal S-sectional (resp. N-sectional) path. Then there exists $k \le n-2+\delta$ such that all roots in ρ contain $-\varepsilon_k$ as their summand and ρ starts (resp. ends) at level 1. Here $\delta = 1$ if $\{n-1, n\}$ are sink or source, $\delta = 0$ otherwise.*

Proof. Assume that ρ is a shallow maximal S-sectional path. We claim that it starts at level 1. If it does not start at level 1. Lemma 1.11 (d) implies that it ends at level $n-1$ or n. Thus we can draw ρ as follows:

$$S_1 \longrightarrow S_2 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow S_{l-1} \longrightarrow S_l.$$

Then $S_l = \underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(l)$ for some $l \leq n-2$. By (1.2), Corollary 1.18 and Remark 1.21, we have $S_l = \varepsilon_{a_l} - \varepsilon_k$ $(1 \leq k \leq n-2+\delta)$ which is contained in the a_l-swing. By the same reason, S_{l-1} is also contained in another a_{l-1}-swing $(a_l \neq a_{l-1})$ and

$$S_{l-1} = \varepsilon_{a_{l-1}} \pm \varepsilon_c \quad \text{for some} \quad a_{l-1} < c.$$

By Lemma 1.11 (c), S_{l-1} must be the same as $\varepsilon_{a_{l-1}} - \varepsilon_k$. Thus we can prove that all S_i contains $-\varepsilon_k$ successively. In the similar way, we can prove the case when ρ is a shallow maximal N-sectional path. □

For a shallow maximal N-sectional (resp. S-sectional) path ρ, we say that ρ is the shallow maximal $(N,-a)$-sectional (resp. $(S,-a)$-sectional) path if all of its roots contain $-\varepsilon_a$ as their summand.

Corollary 1.24.

(a) 1-*component and* 2-*component are adjacent in* Γ_Q.

(b) *The longest root is located at*

$$\phi^{-1}(\varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_2) = \begin{cases} (n-2, \xi_1 - n + 1)) & \text{if } 1 \text{ is a source,} \\ (n-2, \xi_1 - n + 3) & \text{if } 1 \text{ is a sink.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Note that 1 is a source or a sink, always. Assume that 1 is a source. The we have $\phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) = (1, \xi_1)$ and 1-swing is of the form (1.21)((1.22) also) with its $N_1 = \alpha_1$. Note that 2 is a left intermediate or a sink, since 1 is a source.

(i) If 2 is a left intermediate, we have $\phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) = (1, \xi_1 - 2)$ and 2-swing is of the form (1.21) with its $N_1 = \alpha_2$. Thus the root located at $(n-2, \xi_1 - n + 1)$ must contain ε_1 and ε_2 as its summands, simultaneously. Thus our assertion follows.

(ii) If 2 is a sink, then $\phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) = (2, \xi_1 - 2n + 1)$ and 2-swing is of the form (1.21) with its $N_2 = \alpha_2$. Thus its S_1 is located at $(1, \xi_1 - 2)$. By the same reason, we can obtain our assertion.

For the case when 1 is a sink, one can verify by using the similar argument. □

Now, Theorem 1.20 and Theorem 1.23 provide also a way to compute Γ_Q:

Remark 1.25.

(a) Fill out vertices in Γ_Q by using the height function ξ and Lemma 1.12.

(b) Using Lemma 1.11 (a) and (b), label the vertices corresponding to simple roots.

(c) Using Theorem 1.20 with step (b), we can label the summand of all vertices.

(d) Using Lemma 1.13, we can complete the labeling of all vertices at level $n-1$ and n.
(e) Using Theorem 1.23, we can complete the labeling of all vertices.

Let σ be a subset of Φ_n^+ defined as follows:

$$\sigma := \big\{\beta \in \Phi_n^+ \mid \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) = n-1,\ \beta \notin \{\alpha_{n-1}, \alpha_n\}\big\}. \tag{1.23}$$

Then Theorem 1.20 tells that $|\sigma| = n-2$ and each element in σ is contained in only one swing. We set, for $1 \le k \le n-3$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\bullet \text{ the positive roots in } \sigma = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n-2}\} \text{ as } \phi_2^{-1}(\sigma_{k+1}) + 2 = \phi_2^{-1}(\sigma_k), \\ &\bullet \text{ indices } \{i_{\sigma_1}, i_{\sigma_2}, \dots, i_{\sigma_{n-2}}\} = \{1, 2, \dots, n-2\} \text{ such that } \sigma_k \text{ is contained in} \\ &\quad i_{\sigma_k}\text{-swing.} \end{aligned} \tag{1.24}$$

Corollary 1.26.

(a) *A multiplicity non-free positive root $\{a, b\}$ is contained in the longer part of the b-swing.*
(b) *There exists $1 \le \ell \le n-2$ such that $i_{\sigma_\ell} = 1$ and*

$$i_{\sigma_1} > i_{\sigma_2} > \cdots > i_{\sigma_\ell} = 1 < i_{\sigma_{\ell-1}} < \cdots < i_{\sigma_{n-2}}, \tag{1.25}$$

where the shorter part of i_{σ_a} $(a < \ell)$ is the N-part and the shorter part of i_{σ_b} $(b > \ell)$ is the S-part .

Proof. (a) Assume that it is contained in the shorter part, and S-part is the shorter part of the b-swing. Then it is contained in the N-part of the a-swing. Note that

$$\text{the } S\text{-part and } N\text{-part of } a\text{-swing are strictly longer than } S\text{-part of } b\text{-swing.} \tag{1.26}$$

Then there is a vertex (i, p) such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\bullet\ i = \phi_1^{-1}(\underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(b)) - 1,\ p = \phi_2^{-1}(\underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(b)) - 1, \text{ (Theorem 1.20)} \\ &\bullet\ p > \xi_i - 2(n-2) \text{ and } (i,p) \notin \Gamma_Q, \text{ (by (1.26))} \end{aligned} \tag{1.27}$$

which yields a contradiction to (1.6). By applying the similar argument, one can complete the proof for the first assertion.
(b) Note that there is $1 \le \ell \le n-2$ such that $i_{\sigma_\ell} = 1$. For $k < l < \ell$, we first show that $i_{\sigma_k} > i_{\sigma_l}$. Note that the shorter part of i_{σ_a} $(a < \ell)$ is an N-part. Indeed, if the shorter part of i_{σ_a} is an S-part, the fact that S-part and N-part of 1-swing are strictly longer than the shorter part of the a-swing yields a contradiction by the same reason in (a). Thus N-parts of i_{σ_k}-swing and i_{σ_l}-swing are shorter parts.

If $i_{\sigma_k} < i_{\sigma_l}$, then N-parts of i_{σ_k}-swing is longer than N-parts of i_{σ_l}. Then there exist a vertex (i, p) satisfying (1.27) by setting $b = i_{\sigma_l}$. Thus we have a contradiction. For $k > l > \ell$, we can apply the similar argument and hence $i_{\sigma_k} > i_{\sigma_l}$. □

Let κ be a subset of Φ_n^+ defined as follows:

$$\kappa := \{\beta \in \Phi_n^+ \mid \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) = 1\}. \tag{1.28}$$

We enumerate the positive roots in $\kappa = \{\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{n-1}\}$ in the following way:

$$\phi_2^{-1}(\kappa_{i+1}) + 2 = \phi_2^{-1}(\kappa_i), \quad \text{for } 1 \le i \le n-2.$$

Then (1.12), Proposition 1.19 and Theorem 1.23 tell that $|\kappa| = n-1$ and each element in κ is contained in only one shallow maximal path, maximal path sharing $\varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}'}$ or maximal path sharing $-\varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}'}$. We set, for $1 \le k \le n-1$, indices

$$\{j_{\kappa_1}, j_{\kappa_2}, \dots, j_{\kappa_{n-1}}\} = \{-2, \dots, -n+2, \mathtt{t}', -\mathtt{t}'\}$$

such that κ_s contains $-\varepsilon_{-j_{\kappa_s}}$ as its summand.

The following lemma can be proved by using Remark 1.25 and the similar argument in Corollary 1.26:

Corollary 1.27. *Notice that $\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2$ is the longest root in Φ^+. We have the followings:*

(a) $\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 = \begin{cases} \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + \cdots + \kappa_{n-2} & \text{if } 1 \text{ is a sink}, \\ \kappa_2 + \kappa_3 + \cdots + \kappa_{n-1} & \text{if } 1 \text{ is a source.} \end{cases}$

(b) *There exists $\mathtt{l}$ such that*

$$|j_{\kappa_{n-1}}| < \ldots < |j_{\kappa_1}| = \mathtt{t}' = |j_{\kappa_{1-1}}| > |j_{\kappa_{1-2}}| > \cdots > |j_{\kappa_1}|,$$

and the maximal sectional path sharing $-\varepsilon_{j_{\kappa_s}}$ is the S-sectional, if $s \le \mathtt{l}-1$, and the maximal sectional path sharing $-\varepsilon_{j_{\kappa_s}}$ is the N-sectional, otherwise.

(c) $\displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \kappa_i = 2\varepsilon_1$ *and* $\displaystyle\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{\mathtt{l}-1} \kappa_i, \sum_{i=\mathtt{l}}^{n-1} \kappa_i\right\} = \{\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}'}, \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}'}\}.$

2. The generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality

In this section, we briefly recall the basic materials of quantum affine algebras and quiver Hecke algebras following [29, 30]. For precise definitions in this subsection, we refer [22, 29, 30].

2.1. **Quantum affine algebras and their finite dimensional integrable modules.** Set $I = I_0 \bigsqcup \{0\}$. An affine Cartan datum $(\mathsf{A}, \mathsf{P}^\vee, \mathsf{P}, \Pi^\vee, \Pi)$ consists of (i) a *generalized affine Cartan matrix* $\mathsf{A} = (a_{i,j})_{i,j\in I}$, (ii) a *dual weight lattice* $\mathsf{P}^\vee = \bigoplus_{i=0}^n \mathbb{Z}h_i \oplus \mathbb{Z}d$, (iii) a *weight lattice* $\mathsf{P} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^n \mathbb{Z}\Lambda_i \oplus \mathbb{Z}\delta$, (iv) a set of *simple coroots* $\Pi^\vee = \{h_i \mid i \in I\} \subset \mathsf{P}^\vee$ and (v) a set of *simple roots* $\Pi = \{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\} \subset \mathsf{P}$ such that

- $\delta = \sum_{i\in I} \mathsf{a}_i h_i$ is the *null root* ([20, Chapter 4]),
- $\langle h_i, \alpha_j\rangle = a_{ij}$ and $\langle h_j, \Lambda_i\rangle = \delta_{ij}$ for all $i, j \in I$, (2.1)
- $\Pi^\vee$ and Π are linearly independent sets.

Note that A is *symmetrizable*; i.e., there exists a diagonal matrix $\mathsf{D} := \mathrm{diag}(\mathsf{d}_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid i \in I)$ such that DA is symmetric.

We denote by $\mathsf{Q} = \bigoplus_{i\in I} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i$ the *root lattice*, $\mathsf{Q}^+ = \bigoplus_{i\in I} \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\alpha_i$ and $c = \sum_{i\in I} \mathsf{c}_i\alpha_i$ the *center*.

Let $(\ ,\ )$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-valued symmetric bilinear form on P satisfying

$$\langle h_i, \lambda\rangle = \frac{2(\alpha_i,\lambda)}{\alpha_i,\alpha_i} \text{ and } (\delta,\lambda) = \langle c,\lambda\rangle \text{ for any } \lambda \in \mathsf{P}.$$

For an indeterminate q, we define $q_i = q^{(\alpha_i,\alpha_i)/2}$. Let $\mathbf{k}$ be an algebraic closure of $\mathbb{C}(q)$ in $\cup_{k>0}\mathbb{C}((q^{1/k}))$.

The *quantum affine algebra* $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ associated with an affine Cartan datum $(\mathsf{A}, \mathsf{P}^\vee, \mathsf{P}, \Pi^\vee, \Pi)$ is the associate $\mathbf{k}$-algebra with generators e_i, f_i $(i \in I)$ and q^h $(h \in \mathsf{P}^\vee)$ with certain relations (see e.g. [30, Definition 2.1]). The $U'_q(\mathfrak{g})$, also called a *quantum affine algebra*, is a subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by e_i, f_i and $K_i^{\pm 1}$ $(i \in I)$, where $K_i := q_i^{h_i}$.

We choose $0 \in I$ as the leftmost vertices in the tables in [20, pages 54, 55] except $A^{(2)}_{2n}$-case in which we take the longest simple root as α_0. Note that the subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by e_i, f_i and $K_i^{\pm 1}$ $(i \in I_0)$ is isomorphic to the universal enveloping algebra of finite simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_0$

The algebra $U'_q(\mathfrak{g})$ has a Hopf algebra structure with the comultiplication

$$\Delta(K_i) = K_i \otimes K_i, \quad \Delta(e_i) = e_i \otimes K_i^{-1} + 1 \otimes e_i, \quad \Delta(f_i) = f_i \otimes 1 + K_i \otimes f_i. \tag{2.2}$$

Let $\mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{cl}} = \mathsf{P}/\mathbb{Z}\delta$ and $\mathrm{cl} : \mathsf{P} \to \mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}$ be the canonical map. We say that a $U'_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module M is *integrable* if

- $M = \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}} M_\lambda$, where $M_\lambda = \{u \in M \mid K_i u = q_i^{\langle h_i,\lambda\rangle} u \text{ for all } i \in I\}$,
- the action of e_i and f_i on M are locally nilpotent for all $i \in I$.

Let $\mathscr{C}_\mathfrak{g}$ be a category of finite dimensional integrable $U'_q(\mathfrak{g})$-modules. By (2.2), $\mathscr{C}_\mathfrak{g}$ is a stable by tensor product; i.e., for $M, N \in \mathscr{C}_\mathfrak{g}$, we have $M \otimes N \in \mathscr{C}_\mathfrak{g}$.

Let M be a simple module in $\mathscr{C}_\mathfrak{g}$. Then it is known that there exist a unique non-zero vector v_M (up to non-zero constant multiple) of weight $\lambda \in \mathsf{P}^0_{\mathrm{cl}} := \{\lambda \in \mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{cl}} \mid \langle c,\lambda\rangle = 0\}$ such that $\langle \lambda, h_i\rangle \geq 0$ $(i \in I_0)$ and all weights of M are contained in $\lambda - \sum_{i\in I_0} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\alpha_i$.

Set $\varpi_i = \gcd(\mathsf{c}_0, \mathsf{c}_i)^{-1}(\mathsf{c}_0\Lambda_i - \mathsf{c}_i\Lambda_0) \in \mathsf{P}$ for $i \in I_0$. Then there exists a unique simple $U'_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module $V(\varpi_i)$ $(i \in I_0)$ in $\mathscr{C}_\mathfrak{g}$ (up to isomorphism) satisfying the following properties:

- The weights of $V(\varpi_i)$ are contained in the convex hull of $W_0\varpi_i$,
- $\dim V(\varpi_i)_{\varpi_i} = 1$,
- For any $\mu \in W_0\varpi_i$, there exists a non-zero vector u_μ such that

$$u_{s_i\mu} = \begin{cases} f_i^{(\langle h_i,\mu\rangle)} u_\mu & \text{if } \langle h_i,\mu\rangle \geq 0, \\ e_i^{(\langle h_i,\mu\rangle)} u_\mu & \text{if } \langle h_i,\mu\rangle \leq 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } i \in I.$$

We call $V(\varpi_i)$ the *ith fundamental representation* ([1, §1.3]).

For $M \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, the *affinization* M_{aff} is a P-graded $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-module

$$M_{\mathrm{aff}} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathsf{P}} (M_{\mathrm{aff}})_\lambda$$

for which $(M_{\mathrm{aff}})_\lambda = M_{\mathrm{cl}(\lambda)}$ and the action of e_i and f_i are defined in a way that they commutes with the canonical map $\mathrm{cl} : M_{\mathrm{aff}} \to M$.

For $x \in \mathbf{k}^\times$ and $M \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, we define

$$M_x := M_{\mathrm{aff}}/(z_M - x)M_{\mathrm{aff}} \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$$

where z_M denotes the $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-automorphism of M_{aff} of weight δ (see, [21, §2.2]).

Definition 2.1. [18] (see also. [22, §3.3]) Let Q be the Dynkin quiver of finite type D_n (resp. A_n). Set $\mathfrak{g} = D_n^{(1)}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_0 = D_n$ (resp. $\mathfrak{g} = A_n^{(1)}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_0 = A_n$). For every $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$ associated to $\mathfrak{g}_0$, we define the $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-module $V_Q(\beta)$ as follows:

$$V_Q(\beta) := V(\varpi_i)_{(-q)^p} \quad \text{for} \quad \phi^{-1}(\beta) = (i,p). \tag{2.3}$$

The subcategory $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)}$ is the smallest abelian full subcategory of $\mathscr{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ satisfying

(a) $V_Q(\beta) \in \mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)}$ for all $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$,
(b) it is stable by taking subquotient, tensor product and extension.

A simple integrable $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-module $M \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is *good* if M has a *bar involution*, *a crystal basis* and a *global basis* (see [23] for precise definitions). For example, $V(\varpi_i)_{(-q)^p}$ for $(i,p) \in \mathbb{Z}Q$ is a good module.

For a good module M and N, there exist a $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-homomorphism

$$R^{\mathrm{norm}}_{M_1,M_2} : M_{\mathrm{aff}} \otimes N_{\mathrm{aff}} \to \mathbf{k}(z_M, z_N) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}[z_M^{\pm 1}, z_N^{\pm 1}]} N_{\mathrm{aff}} \otimes M_{\mathrm{aff}}$$

such that

$$R^{\mathrm{norm}}_{M,N} \circ z_M = z_M \circ R^{\mathrm{norm}}_{M,N},\ R^{\mathrm{norm}}_{M,N} \circ z_N = z_N \circ R^{\mathrm{norm}}_{M,N} \text{ and } R^{\mathrm{norm}}_{M,N}(v_M \otimes v_N) = v_N \otimes v_M.$$

The *denominator* $d_{M,N}$ of $R^{\mathrm{norm}}_{M,N}$ is the unique non-zero monic polynomial $d(u) \in \mathbf{k}[u]$ of smallest degree such that

$$d_{M,N}(z_N/z_M) R^{\mathrm{norm}}_{M,N}(M_{\mathrm{aff}} \otimes N_{\mathrm{aff}}) \subset (N_{\mathrm{aff}} \otimes M_{\mathrm{aff}}). \tag{2.4}$$

The module $V(\varpi_i)$ has a left dual $V(\varpi_i)^*$ and a right dual ${}^*V(\varpi_i)$ with the duality $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-morphisms:

$$\begin{aligned} &V(\varpi_i)^* \otimes V(\varpi_i) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{tr}} \mathbf{k} \quad \text{and} \quad V(\varpi_i) \otimes {}^*V(\varpi_i) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{tr}} \mathbf{k}, \quad \text{where} \\ &V(\varpi_i)^* := V(\varpi_{i^*})_{(p^*)^{-1}},\ {}^*V(\varpi_i) := V(\varpi_{i^*})_{p^*} \quad \text{and} \quad p^* := (-1)^{\langle \rho^\vee, \delta \rangle} q^{(\rho,\delta)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Here ρ and $\rho^\vee$ denote elements in P and $\mathsf{P}^\vee$ such that $\langle h_i, \rho \rangle = 1$ and $\langle \rho^\vee, \alpha_i \rangle = 1$ for all $i \in I$.

The following theorem tells that the denominators $d_{i,j}(z) := d_{V(\varpi_i),V(\varpi_j)}(z)$ of $R^{\mathrm{norm}}_{V(\varpi_i),V(\varpi_j)}$ $(i,j \in I_0)$ provide important information about the category $\mathscr{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$:

Theorem 2.2. [1, 23]

(1) *The zeros of* $d_{i,j}(z) \in \mathbb{C}[[q^{1/m}]]q^{1/m}$ *for some* $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.
(2) $V(\varpi_i)_{a_i} \otimes V(\varpi_j)_{a_j}$ *is simple if and only if* $d_{i,j}(a_i/a_j) \neq 0$ *and* $d_{i,j}(a_j/a_i) \neq 0$.
(3) *For any simple integrable* $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$*-module* M*, there exists a unique finite sequence* (*up to permutation*)

$$((i_1, a_1), \dots, (i_l, a_l)) \text{ in } (I_0 \times \mathbf{k}^\times)^l$$

such that $d_{i_k,i_{k'}}(a_{k'}/a_k) \neq 0$ *for* $1 \leq k < k' \leq l$ *and* M *appears as the head of* $\otimes_{i=1}^{l} V(\varpi_{i_k})_{a_k}$.

2.2. **The Dorey's type morphisms and denominators** $d_{k,l}(z)$ **when** $\mathfrak{g} = D_n^{(1)}$ **and** $\mathfrak{g} = D_{n+1}^{(2)}$**.** In this subsection, we recall some family of morphisms in $\mathscr{C}_\mathfrak{g}$, called by *Dorey's type morphisms*, and denominators $d_{k,l}(z)$ of $R_{k,l}^{\mathrm{norm}}(z)$ for untwisted and twisted quantum affine algebra of type D. After that we observe their similarities.

We say that an element in $\mathrm{Hom}_{U_q'(\mathfrak{g})}(V(\varpi_i)_{(-q)^a} \otimes V(\varpi_j)_{(-q)^b}, V(\varpi_k)_{(-q)^b})$ is a *Dorey's type morphism* [9]. This kind of morphisms were studied at [9] for untwisted affine types $\mathfrak{g} = A_n^{(1)}$, $B_n^{(1)}$, $C_n^{(1)}$ and $D_n^{(1)}$. Recently, the author investigated such type morphisms for twisted affine types $\mathfrak{g} = A_{2n}^{(2)}$, $A_{2n-1}^{(2)}$ and $D_{n+1}^{(2)}$ in [29].

Theorem 2.3. [9, Theorem 6.1] (*see also.* [22, Appendix A]) *Let* $\mathfrak{g}$ *be of type* $D_n^{(1)}$ *and* $(i,x),(j,y),(k,z) \in I_0 \times \mathbf{k}^\times$. *Then*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{U_q'(\mathfrak{g})}\big(V(\varpi_i)_x \otimes V(\varpi_j)_y, V(\varpi_k)_z\big) \neq 0$$

if and only if one of the following conditions holds:

$$\text{(2.6)} \quad \begin{cases} \text{(i) } \ell := \max(i,j,k) \leq n-2,\ s+m=\ell \text{ for } \{s,m\} := \{i,j,k\} \setminus \{\ell\} \text{ and} \\ \qquad \big(x/z, y/z\big) = \begin{cases} \big((-q)^{-j}, (-q)^{i}\big), & \text{if } \ell = k, \\ \big((-q)^{-j}, (-q)^{-i+2n-2}\big), & \text{if } \ell = i, \\ \big((-q)^{j-2n+2}, (-q)^{i}\big), & \text{if } \ell = j, \end{cases} \\ \text{(ii) } i+j \geq n,\ k = 2n-2-i-j,\ \max(i,j,k) \leq n-2, \text{ and } x/z = (-q)^{-j},\ y/z = (-q)^{i}, \\ \text{(iii) } s := \min(i,j,k) \leq n-2,\ \{m,\ell\} := \{i,j,k\} \setminus \{s\} \subset \{n-1, n\} \text{ and} \\ \qquad \bullet\ n - s \equiv \begin{cases} \ell - m \mod 2 & \text{if } s = k, \\ \ell - m^* \mod 2 & \text{if } s \neq k, \end{cases} \\ \qquad \bullet\ \big(x/z, y/z\big) = \begin{cases} \big((-q)^{-n+k+1}, (-q)^{n-k-1}\big), & \text{if } s = k, \\ \big((-q)^{-n+i+1}, (-q)^{2i}\big), & \text{if } s = i, \\ \big((-q)^{-2j}, (-q)^{n-j-1}\big), & \text{if } s = j. \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

Theorem 2.4. [29, Theorem 3.6, Theorem 3.8] *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be of type $D^{(2)}_{n+1}$ and $(i,x),(j,y),(k,z) \in I_0 \times \mathbf{k}^\times$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{U'_q(\mathfrak{g})}\big(V(\varpi_i)_x \otimes V(\varpi_j)_y, V(\varpi_k)_z\big) \neq 0$$

if one of the following conditions holds:

$$\text{(2.7)}\quad \begin{cases} \text{(i}') \ \ell := \max(i,j,k) \le n-1,\ s+m=\ell \text{ for } \{s,m\} := \{i,j,k\}\setminus\{\ell\} \text{ and} \\ \qquad \big(x/z, y/z\big) = \begin{cases} \big((-q^2)^{-j/2}, (-q^2)^{i/2}\big), & \text{if } \ell = k, \\ \big((-q^2)^{-j/2}, (-q)^{-i/2+n}\big), & \text{if } \ell = i, \\ \big((-q^2)^{j/2-n}, (-q)^{i}\big), & \text{if } \ell = j, \end{cases} \quad (\text{up to sign}) \\ \text{(iii}') \ s := \min(i,j,k) \le n-1,\ \{m,\ell\} := \{i,j,k\}\setminus\{s\} \subset \{n\} \text{ and} \\ \qquad \big(x/z, y/z\big) = \begin{cases} \big(\pm\sqrt{-1}(-q^2)^{\frac{-n+k}{2}}, \mp\sqrt{-1}(-q)^{\frac{n-k}{2}}\big), & \text{if } s = k, \\ \big(\pm\sqrt{-1}(-q)^{\frac{-n+i}{2}}, (-q^2)^{i}\big), & \text{if } s = i, \\ \big((-q^2)^{-j}, \pm\sqrt{-1}(-q^2)^{\frac{n-j}{2}}\big), & \text{if } s = j. \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

Now we fix a Dynkin quiver Q of finite type D_{n+1} and take a height function ξ on Q satisfying

$$\xi_n \equiv \xi_{n+1} \equiv 0 \pmod 2.$$

For $1 \le i \le n+1$ and $p \in \mathbb{Z}$, we set

$$\text{(2.8)}\quad \begin{aligned} \{1,\dots,n\} \ni i^\star &:= \begin{cases} i & \text{if } 1 \le i \le n-1, \\ n & \text{if } i = n \text{ or } n+1, \end{cases} \\ ((-q)^p)^\star &:= \begin{cases} (\sqrt{-1})^{\delta(n+1\equiv i \pmod 2)+1}(-q)^p & \text{if } 1 \le i \le n-1, \\ (-1)^i(-q)^p & \text{if } i = n \text{ or } n+1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

With the map (2.8), we can associate an injective map

$$\begin{aligned} {}^\star\colon \big\{V(\varpi_i)_{a(-q)^p} \in \mathscr{C}_{D^{(1)}_{n+1}} \mid 1 \le i \le n+1,\ a \in \mathbb{C}^\times,\ p \in \mathbb{Z}\big\} \\ \longrightarrow \big\{V(\varpi_i)_{a(-q)^p} \in \mathscr{C}_{D^{(2)}_{n+1}} \mid 1 \le i \le n,\ a \in \mathbb{C}^\times,\ p \in \mathbb{Z}\big\} \end{aligned}$$

given by (see [16])

$$(V(\varpi_i)_{(-q)^p})^\star := V(\varpi_{i^\star})_{((-q)^p)^\star} \in \mathscr{C}_{D^{(2)}_{n+1}}.$$

For each $\beta \in \Phi^+_n$ with $\phi^{-1}(\beta) = (i,p)$, we define

$$\text{(2.9)}\qquad \mathsf{V}_Q(\beta) := (V_Q(\beta))^\star = \begin{cases} V(\varpi_i)_{(\sqrt{-1})^{\delta(n+1\equiv i \pmod 2)+1}(-q)^p} & \text{if } 1 \le i \le n-1, \\ V(\varpi_n)_{(-1)^i(-q)^p} & \text{if } i = n \text{ or } n+1, \end{cases}$$

which is the good module over $U'_q(D^{(2)}_{n+1})$.

For $1 \le i \le n-1$, it is known that ([1, (1.7)])

$$V(\varpi_i) \simeq V(\varpi_i)_{-1} \in \mathscr{C}_{D^{(2)}_{n+1}}. \tag{2.10}$$

Remark 2.5. By replacing n in Theorem 2.3 with $n+1$ and considering (2.10) together, one can observe that

(a) p^* of $D^{(1)}_{n+1}$ is $(-q)^{2n}$ and p^* of $D^{(2)}_{n+1}$ is $-(-q^2)^n$,

(b) for a surjective $U'_q(D^{(1)}_{n+1})$-homomorphism of types (i) and (iii) in Theorem 2.3

$$V(\varpi_i)_a \otimes V(\varpi_j)_b \twoheadrightarrow V(\varpi_k)_c,$$

we have a $U'_q(D^{(2)}_{n+1})$-homomorphism of types (i′) and (iii′) in Theorem 2.4

$$V(\varpi_{i^\star})_{a^\star} \otimes V(\varpi_{j^\star})_{b^\star} \twoheadrightarrow V(\varpi_{k^\star})_{c^\star}.$$

Now we record the denominators $d_{k,l}(z)$ for $\mathfrak{g} = D^{(1)}_n$ and $D^{(2)}_{n+1}$.

Theorem 2.6. [22, Appendix A] [29, Section 4]

(a) *For $1 \le k,l \le n$ and $\mathfrak{g} = D^{(1)}_n$, we have*

$$d_{k,l}(z) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\prod_{s=1}^{\min(k,l)} (z-(-q)^{|k-l|+2s})(z-(-q)^{2n-2-k-l+2s}) & \text{if } 1 \le k,l \le n-2, \\ \displaystyle\prod_{s=1}^{k} (z-(-q)^{n-k-1+2s}) & \text{if } 1 \le k \le n-2 < l, \\ \displaystyle\prod_{s=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} (z-(-q)^{4s}) & \text{if } \{k,l\} = \{n, n-1\}, \\ \displaystyle\prod_{s=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} (z-(-q)^{4s-2}) & \text{if } k = l \in \{n-1, n\}. \end{cases} \tag{2.11}$$

(b) *For $1 \le k,l \le n$ and $\mathfrak{g} = D^{(2)}_{n+1}$, we have*

$$d_{k,l}(z) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\prod_{s=1}^{\min(k,l)} (z^2-(-q^2)^{|k-l|+2s})(z^2-(-q^2)^{2n-k-l+2s}) & \text{if } 1 \le k,l \le n-1, \\ \displaystyle\prod_{s=1}^{k} (z^2+(-q^2)^{n-k+2s}) & \text{if } 1 \le k \le n-1 < l = n, \\ \displaystyle\prod_{s=1}^{n} (z+(-q^2)^{s}) & \text{if } k = l = n. \end{cases} \tag{2.12}$$

From (2.11) and (2.12), one can observe that $d_{k,l}(z)$ has a zero of multiplicity 2 when

(i) $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type $D^{(1)}_n$ $(n \ge 4)$ and $z = (-q)^s$ where ([22, Lemma 3.2.4])

$$2 \le k,l \le n-2,\ k+l > n-1,\ 2n-k-l \le s \le k+l \text{ and } s \equiv k+l \mod 2. \tag{2.13}$$

(ii) $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type $D_{n+1}^{(2)}$ $(n \geq 3)$ and $z = (-q^2)^{s/2}$ where ([29, Corollary 4.16])

$$2 \leq k, l \leq n-1,\ k+l > n,\ 2n+2-k-l \leq s \leq k+l \text{ and } s \equiv k+l \mod 2. \tag{2.14}$$

We want to emphasize that

(2.15) (a) if we replace n in (2.13) with $n+1$, we can obtain the condition (2.14),
(b) the condition (2.6) (ii) satisfies the condition (2.13).

2.3. **Quiver Hecke algebras and the generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality functors.** Let $\mathbf{k}$ be a field. For a given symmetrizable Cartan matrix A, we choose a polynomials $\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(u,v) \in \mathbf{k}[u,v]$, for $i,j \in I$, of the form

$$\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(u,v) = \begin{cases} \sum_{p(\alpha_i,\alpha_i)+q(\alpha_j,\alpha_j)+2(\alpha_i,\alpha_j)=0} t_{i,j;p,q} u^p v^q & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ 0 & \text{if } i = j, \end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

where $t_{i,j;p,q} \in \mathbf{k}$ are such that $t_{i,j;-a_{ij},0} \neq 0$, and $t_{i,j;p,q} = t_{j,i;q,p}$. Thus $\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(u,v) = \mathcal{Q}_{j,i}(v,u)$. The symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_m = \langle \mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{s}_{m-1} \rangle$ acts on I^m by place permutations.

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\beta \in \mathsf{Q}^+$ such that $\mathrm{ht}(\beta) = n$, we set

$$I^\beta = \{\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \in I^n \mid \alpha_{\nu_1} + \cdots + \alpha_{\nu_n} = \beta\}.$$

For $\beta \in \mathsf{Q}^+$, we denote by $R(\beta)$ the quiver Hecke algebra at β associated with $(\mathsf{A}, \mathsf{P}, \Pi, \mathsf{P}^\vee, \Pi^\vee)$ and $(Q_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}$. It is a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded $\mathbf{k}$-algebra generated by the generators $\{e(\nu)\}_{\nu \in I^\beta}$, $\{x_k\}_{1 \leq k \leq n}$, $\{\tau_m\}_{1 \leq m \leq n-1}$ with certain defining relations (see e.g [30, Definition 2.7]).

Let $\mathrm{Rep}(R(\beta))$ be the category of finite dimensional graded $R(\beta)$-modules and $[\mathrm{Rep}(R(\beta))]$ be the Grothendieck group of $\mathrm{Rep}(R(\beta))$. Then $[\mathrm{Rep}(R(\beta))]$ has a natural $\mathbb{Z}[q,q^{-1}]$-module structure induced by the grading shift. More precisely, $(qM)_k = M_{k+1}$ for $M \in \mathrm{Rep}(R(\beta))$ such that $M = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} M_k$.

For $M \in \mathrm{Rep}(R(\beta))$ and $N \in \mathrm{Rep}(R(\gamma))$ for $\beta, \gamma \in \mathsf{Q}^+$, we have the module $M \circ N \in \mathrm{Rep}(R(\beta+\gamma))$ induced by the *convolution product*. Then $[\mathrm{Rep}(R)] := \bigoplus_{\beta \in \mathsf{Q}^+} [\mathrm{Rep}(R(\beta))]$ has a natural algebra structure induced by the convolution product. For $M \in \mathrm{Rep}(\beta)$ and $M_k \in \mathrm{Rep}(\beta_k)$ $(1 \leq k \leq n)$, we denote by

$$M^{\circ 0} := \mathbf{k}, \quad M^{\circ r} = \underbrace{M \circ \cdots \circ M}_{r}, \quad \overset{n}{\underset{k=1}{\circ}} M_k = M_1 \circ \cdots \circ M_n.$$

For a fixed reduced expression $\widetilde{w}_0$ of w_0, let us consider the convex total order $<_{\widetilde{w}_0}$ on Φ_n^+

$$\beta_1 <_{\widetilde{w}_0} \beta_2 <_{\widetilde{w}_0} \cdots <_{\widetilde{w}_0} \beta_{\mathsf{N}}.$$

For sequences $\underline{m},\ \underline{m}' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\mathsf{N}}$, we define an order $\leq_{\widetilde{w}_0}^{\mathsf{b}}$ as follows ([27]):

$\underline{m}' = (m_1', \dots, m_N') <_{\widetilde{w}_0}^{\mathsf{b}} \underline{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_N)$ if and only if there exist integers $k,\ s$ such that $1 \leq k \leq s \leq N$, $m_t' = m_t$ $(t < k)$, $m_k' < m_k$, and $m_t' = m_t$ $(s < t \leq N)$, $m_s' < m_s$.

Note that $\leq^{\mathtt{b}}_{\widetilde{w}_0}$ is a partial order on sequences.

Theorem 2.7. [6, Theorem 4.7][27, Theorem 3.1] *(see also* [24]*) Let $\mathfrak{g}_0$ be a finite simple Lie algebra and $R := \bigoplus_{\beta\in\mathsf{Q}^+} R(\beta)$ be the quiver Hecke algebra corresponding to $\mathfrak{g}_0$. For each positive root $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$, there exists a simple module $S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta)$ satisfying following properties:*

(a) *For every $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\mathsf{N}}$, there exists a non-zero R-module homomorphism*

$$\mathbf{r}_{\underline{m}} \colon \overrightarrow{S}_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\underline{m}) := S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_1)^{\circ m_1} \circ \cdots \circ S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_N)^{\circ m_N} \longrightarrow \overleftarrow{S}_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\underline{m}) := S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_N)^{\circ m_N} \circ \cdots \circ S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_1)^{\circ m_1}.$$

and $\mathrm{Im}(\mathbf{r}_{\underline{m}}) \simeq \mathrm{hd}\left(\overrightarrow{S}_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\underline{m})\right) \simeq \mathrm{soc}\left(\overleftarrow{S}_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\underline{m})\right)$ *is simple.*

(b) *For any sequence $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\mathsf{N}}$, we have* $[\overrightarrow{S}_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\underline{m})] \in [\mathrm{Im}(\mathbf{r}_{\underline{m}})] + \sum_{\underline{m}' <^{\mathtt{b}}_{\widetilde{w}_0} \underline{m}} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\mathrm{Im}(\mathbf{r}_{\underline{m}'})]$.

(c) *For any simple $R(\beta)$-module M, there exist a unique sequence $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\mathsf{N}}$ such that* $M \simeq \mathrm{Im}(\mathbf{r}_{\underline{m}}) \simeq \mathrm{hd}\big(\overrightarrow{S}_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\underline{m})\big)$.

(d) *For a minimal pair (β_k, β_l) of $\beta_j = \beta_k + \beta_l$ with respect to $<_{\widetilde{w}_0}$, there exists an exact sequence of R-modules*

$$0 \to S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_j) \to S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_k) \circ S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_l) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}\neq 0} S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_l) \circ S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_k) \to S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_j) \to 0$$

such that $\mathrm{Im}(\mathbf{r})$ *is simple.*

For any pair of reduced expressions $\widetilde{w}_0$ and $\widetilde{w_0}' \in [\widetilde{w}_0]$, we have

$$S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta) \simeq S_{\widetilde{w}_0'}(\beta) \quad \text{for all } \beta \in \Phi_n^+,$$

by (1.9) and Theorem 2.7 (d). Thus we denote by $S_Q(\beta)$ the simple $R(\beta)$-module $S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta)$ for any reduced expression $\widetilde{w}_0 \in [Q]$.

For a given quiver $\Gamma = (\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)$ and $i, j \in \Gamma_0$, we denote by

$$\Gamma[i,j] \text{ the number of arrows } \mathsf{a} \text{ in } \Gamma_1 \text{ such that } s(\mathsf{a}) = i \text{ and } t(\mathsf{a}) = j.$$

Define a generalized symmetric Cartan matrix $\mathsf{A}^\Gamma = (a_{i,j}^\Gamma)_{i,j\in\Gamma_0}$ and a set of polynomials $(\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}^\Gamma(u,v))_{i,j\in\Gamma_0}$ associated to the given quiver Γ as follows:

(2.17)

$$a_{i,j}^\Gamma = \begin{cases} 2 & \\ -\Gamma[i,j] - \Gamma[j,i] & \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Q}_{i,j}^\Gamma(u,v) = \begin{cases} (u-v)^{\Gamma[i,j]}(v-u)^{\Gamma[j,i]} & \text{if } i \neq j \in \Gamma_0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We denote by R^Γ the quiver Hecke algebra associated with the polynomials $(\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}^\Gamma(u,v))_{i,j\in\Gamma_0}$.

From now on, we recall the *quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality functors* which were introduced in [21, 22].

Let $\{V_s\}_{s\in\mathcal{S}}$ be a family of good $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-modules labeled by an index set $\mathcal{S}$. For a triple (J, X, s) consisting of

$$\text{(i) } J \text{ is an index set, (ii) a map } X : J \to \mathbf{k}^\times, \text{ (iii) a map } s : J \to \mathcal{S},$$

we can associate a quiver $Q^J = (Q_0^J, Q_1^J)$ as follows:

$$Q_0^J = J \text{ and } Q^J[i,j] \text{ is the order of the zero of } d_{V_{s(i)},V_{s(j)}} \text{ at } X(j)/X(i) \text{ for } i,j \in J.$$

Theorem 2.8. [21] *There exists a functor*

$$\mathcal{F} : \mathrm{Rep}(R^{Q^J}) \to \mathscr{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$$

which satisfies the following properties:

(a) *$\mathcal{F}$ is a tensor functor. Namely, there exist $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-module isomorphisms*

$$\mathcal{F}(R^{Q^J}(0)) \simeq \mathbf{k} \text{ and } \mathcal{F}(M_1 \circ M_2) \simeq \mathcal{F}(M_1) \otimes \mathcal{F}(M_2) \text{ for any } M_1, M_2 \in \mathrm{Rep}(R^{Q^J}).$$

(b) *If the underlying graph of Q^J is a Dynkin diagram of finite type A, D and E, then the functor $\mathcal{F}$ is exact.*

We call the functor $\mathcal{F}$ the *generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality functor*.

Theorem 2.9. [22] *For $\mathfrak{g} = D_n^{(1)}$ (resp. $A_n^{(1)}$) and Q a Dynkin quiver of finite type A_n (resp. D_n), take*

$$J := \left\{ (i,p) \in \mathbb{Z}Q \mid \widehat{\phi}(i,p) \in \Pi_n \times \{0\} \right\}.$$

We also take two maps $s : J \to \{V(\varpi_i) \mid i \in I_0\}$ and $X : J \to \mathbf{k}^\times$ given by

$$s(i,p) = V(\varpi_i) \quad \text{and} \quad X(i,p) = (-q)^p \quad \text{for } (i,p) \in J.$$

(a) *The underlying graphs of Q^J and Q coincide. Thus the functor*

$$\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)} : \mathrm{Rep}(R^{Q^J}) \to \mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)} \text{ is exact.}$$

(b) *The functor $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$ sends simples to simples, bijectively. In particular,*

$$\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}(S_Q(\beta)) \simeq V_Q(\beta).$$

Remark 2.10. In the above theorem, the functor $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$ is a faithful functor by the following argument: For any non-zero homomorphism f in $\mathrm{Rep}(R^{Q^J})$, $\mathrm{Im}(f)$ does not vanish since $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$ sends simples to simples. Thus $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$ is faithful.

3. Dorey's rule on Γ_Q and minimal pair.

In this section, we fix the Dynkin quiver Q of finite type D_n, $\mathfrak{g}$ as $D_n^{(1)}$ and the quiver Hecke algebra R as of finite type D_n. We prove that how Γ_Q codifies the Dorey's rule for $D_n^{(1)}$ and all pair (α, β) of a multiplicity free positive root $\gamma \in \Phi_n^+$ are minimal with suitable total orders. Moreover, we show that there exist $(n-b-1)$-many *non-minimal pairs* (α, β) of a *non-multiplicity free* $\gamma = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b \in \Phi_n^+$. To do this, we need to apply the results in Section 1.

Definition 3.1. Let γ be a vertex in Γ_Q with $1 < \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma) \leq n$. (Equivalently, $\gamma \in \Phi_n^+$.) The *upper ray of* γ is a concatenation of an S-sectional path and an N-sectional path satisfying the following properties:

- $\underbrace{\mathtt{S}_1 \to \cdots \to \mathtt{S}_a \to \mathtt{S}_{a+1}}_{S\text{-sectional path}} = \gamma = \overbrace{\mathtt{N}_{b+1} \to \mathtt{N}_b \to \cdots \to \mathtt{N}_1}^{N\text{-sectional path}}$.
- There is no vertex $\mathtt{S}_0 \in (\Gamma_Q)_0$ such that $\mathtt{S}_0 \to \mathtt{S}_1$ is an S-sectional path in Γ_Q,
- There is no vertex $\mathtt{N}_0 \in (\Gamma_Q)_0$ such that $\mathtt{N}_1 \to \mathtt{N}_0$ is an N-sectional path in Γ_Q.

Lemma 3.2. *For every $\gamma \in \Phi_n^+$ with $1 < \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma) \leq n$, write its upper ray as in* Definition 3.1. *Then we have*

$$\phi_1^{-1}(\mathtt{S}_1) \text{ or } \phi_1^{-1}(\mathtt{N}_1) = 1. \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. (a) Assume that $\gamma = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b$ for $a < b \leq n-2$. Then, by Theorem 1.20 and Theorem 1.23, it is contained in the a-swing and the shallow maximal $(S, -b)$-sectional path, or the shallow maximal $(N, -b)$-sectional path. Thus our assertion follows from Theorem 1.23.

(b) Assume that $\gamma = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b$ for $a < b \leq n-2$. Then, by Theorem 1.20, it is located at the intersection of the a-swing and the b-swing. Then our assertion follows from Corollary 1.26.

(c) Assume that $\gamma = \varepsilon_a \pm \varepsilon_b$ for $a < b$ and $b = n-1$ or n. Then our assertion follows from Lemma 1.13 and Corollary 1.18. □

Proposition 3.3. *For a pair (α, β) of $\alpha + \beta = \gamma \in \Phi_n^+$, assume that the pair (α, β) is contained in the upper ray of γ. Then we have*

$$V_Q(\beta) \otimes V_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad S_Q(\beta) \circ S_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow S_Q(\gamma).$$

Proof. In this proof we give the proof only for the positive roots which are of the form $\gamma = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b$. For the other positive roots, one can prove by applying the similar strategy given in this proof.

By the assumptions, β is in S-part of the upper ray, α is in N-part of the upper ray and $\{\alpha, \beta\} = \{\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c, \varepsilon_c - \varepsilon_b\}$. We assume once more that $\alpha = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c$. Then we have the situation

in Γ_Q as follows:



Then we have a multiplicity free positive root $\kappa_i = \varepsilon_b - \varepsilon_c$ for some $b < c$. Note that, in this case, the maximal S-sectional path ρ containing α is shallow. Now we claim that κ_{i+1} exists and contains ε_c as its summand. Note that one of κ_{i+1} and κ_{i-1} exists. Assume that

$$\kappa_{i-1} \text{ exists and contains } \varepsilon_c \text{ as its summand.} \tag{3.2}$$

Then it must be contained in the S-part of the c-swing. If it is in the N-part of the c-swing, it has an intersection with ρ. Thus the positive root located at the intersection must be $\varepsilon_c - \varepsilon_c$, which yields a contradiction.

Under the assumption (3.2), κ_{i-1} must be in the S-part of the c-swing. In this case, $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_c$ is located at the intersection of the S-part of the c-swing and N-part of upper ray. Thus we have

$$\phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_c) < \phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c)$$

which yields a contradiction to Corollary 1.17. Hence κ_{i-1} can not contain ε_c as its summand.

Now we prove the existence of κ_{i+1}. If it is not exists, then

$$\kappa_i = \kappa_{n-1} = \underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(1) = \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_c.$$

Then κ_{i-1} must contain ε_c as its summand, which is impossible.

Now we need to prove that κ_{i+1} is contained in the N-part of the c-swing. If it is not contained in the N-part of the c-swing, then there is no intersection the shallow maximal $(N, -b)$-sectional path and the c-swing. It implies that $\varepsilon_c - \varepsilon_b \notin \Phi_n^+$ which is impossible. Thus we can conclude that κ_{i+1} is contained in the N-part of the c-swing. Thus we have

$$\mathtt{S}_{u-1} = \varepsilon_c - \varepsilon_b = \beta$$

by Theorem 1.20 and Theorem 1.23. Thus we have

$$\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) + \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) = \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma)$$

which implies our assertion by (2.6) (i). □

3.1. **Multiplicity free positive roots of the form $\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b$ $(a < b \leq n-2)$.**

Lemma 3.4. *Assume $\gamma = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b$, $\alpha = \varepsilon_c - \varepsilon_b$ for $a < c < b \leq n-2$ and $\phi_1^{-1}(\gamma) < \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha)$.*

(a) *If γ is contained in the N-part of the a-swing, then $\beta = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c$ is contained in the S-part of the a-swing.*

(b) *If γ is contained in the S-part of the a-swing, then $\beta = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c$ is contained in the N-part of the a-swing.*

Proof. (a) Assume that β is in the N-part of the a-swing. By the convexity of $\prec_Q$ and Theorem 1.20, $\phi_1^{-1}(\gamma) < \phi_1^{-1}(\beta)$ and hence we have



where $\kappa_u = \varepsilon_{i_u} - \varepsilon_b$, $\kappa_v = \varepsilon_{i_v} - \varepsilon_c$ and ρ is a part of the shallow maximal $(S, -c)$-sectional path. Then κ_{u-1} or κ_{u+1} must contain ε_b as its summand.

(i) Assume κ_{u-1} (resp. κ_{u+1}) contains ε_b and is contained in the S-part of the b-swing. Then $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b$ contained in N-part of the a-swing and $\phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b) < \phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b)$ (resp. $\phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b) < \phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c)$), which is a contradiction to Corollary 1.17.

(ii) Assume κ_{u-1} (resp. κ_{u+1}) contains ε_b and is contained in the N-part of the b-swing. Then we have an intersection of the b-swing and the shallow maximal $(S, -b)$-sectional path (resp. the shallow maximal $(S, -c)$-sectional path), which is impossible.

Thus there is no shallow maximal $(S, -c)$-sectional path and hence our assertion follows. By applying the similar argument, one can prove (b). □

Proposition 3.5. *Assume $\gamma = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b$ $(a < c < b \leq n-2)$. Assume that there exists $\alpha = \varepsilon_c - \varepsilon_b$ such that $a < c < b \leq n-2$ and $\phi_1^{-1}(\gamma) < \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha)$. Then we have*

$$\phi_1^{-1}(\gamma) + \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) = \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha), \qquad \text{where } \beta = \gamma - \alpha.$$

Moreover,

(a) *if there are two (α, β) and (α', β') satisfying the assumption, then we have*

$$|\phi_2^{-1}(\alpha) - \phi_2^{-1}(\beta)| = |\phi_2^{-1}(\alpha') - \phi_2^{-1}(\beta')| = 2n - 2 + \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma).$$

(b) *there is a surjective $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-module homomorphism*

$$V_Q(\beta) \otimes V_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\gamma) \quad \text{or} \quad V_Q(\alpha) \otimes V_Q(\beta) \twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\gamma)$$

and hence there is a surjective R-module homomorphism

$$S_Q(\beta) \circ S_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow S_Q(\gamma) \quad \text{or} \quad S_Q(\alpha) \circ S_Q(\beta) \twoheadrightarrow S_Q(\gamma).$$

Proof. Assume that γ is contained in the S-part of the a-swing. Then Lemma 3.4 tells that γ and α are contained in the shallow maximal N-sectional path:

$$N_r \to N_{r-1} \to \cdots \to N_2 \to N_1,$$

where $\phi_1^{-1}(N_l) = l$, $\alpha = N_t$ and $\gamma = N_s$ for $1 \leq s < t \leq r$. Set $\ell = t - s$.

We first claim that the S-part of the c-swing is shorter than or equal to the N-part of the c-swing. If S-part of the c-swing is longer than the N-part of the c-swing, we have the following

situation:



where $\kappa_u = \varepsilon_c - \varepsilon_{j_u}$. If $\kappa_{u-1} = \varepsilon_{i_{u-1}} - \varepsilon_c$, then any shallow maximal sectional path containing κ_{u-1} can not exist. On the other hand, if $\kappa_{u+1} = \varepsilon_{i_u} - \varepsilon_c$, any shallow maximal sectional path containing κ_{u+1} can not have an intersection with the a-swing. Hence we have the claim.

Now the situation in Γ_Q can be drawn as follows:



where $\kappa_u = \varepsilon_c - \varepsilon_{j_u}$. Then one can observe that $\kappa_{u+1} = \varepsilon_{i_{u+1}} - \varepsilon_c$ and

$$S_\ell = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c.$$

Thus

$$\phi_1^{-1}(\gamma) + \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) = \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad |\phi_2^{-1}(\alpha) - \phi_2^{-1}(\beta)| = 2n - 2 + \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma). \tag{3.3}$$

The assertion (b) follows from the second condition in (2.6) (i) and (3.3). □

Remark 3.6. Let γ be a multiplicity free positive root and (α, β) be a pair of γ. Then Corollary 1.18 and Theorem 1.23 tell that one of α and β should have contained in the shallow maximal sectional path ρ which contains γ together.

Theorem 3.7. *For every pair (α, β) of $\gamma = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b$ $(a < b \leq n-2)$, there is a total order $<$ such that*

(a) *it is a compatible with the convex partial order $\preceq_Q$,*
(b) *(α, β) is a minimal pair of γ with respect to the total order.*

Proof. First, we claim that the following situation can not happen:

$$\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c \text{ and } \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b \text{ are in the same part of the } a\text{-swing and } \phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c) > \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma).$$

Assume that $\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c$ and $\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b$ are contained in N-part of the a-swing. By Theorem 1.23, there are shallow maximal S-sectional paths ρ and ρ' containing γ and $\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c$, respectively. Then we can draw the situation in Γ_Q as follows:



By (1.4), we have

$$\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b + L = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c + N \quad \text{and hence} \quad \mathrm{ht}(N) > \mathrm{ht}(L).$$

However (1.4) also tells that $L = \sum_{k=r}^{s} \kappa_k$. Thus it can not happen. By the similar argument, they can not contained in S-part of the a-swing together whenever $\phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c) > \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma)$.

(3.4) Note that any sum of pair (α', β'), in the level $n-1$ and n, can not be of the form $\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b$.

(a) Now we deal with the following case first:

$$\phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c) < \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma) \text{ are in the same part of the } a\text{-swing.}$$

Assume that they are contained in N-part of the a-swing. Then, by previous observations, one can prove that



where

- κ_{i+1} is a multiplicity free positive root containing ε_c as its summand.
- κ_{i+1} is contained in N-part of the c-swing.

Hence we have $S_{t-1} = \beta = \varepsilon_c - \varepsilon_b$. Thus (α, β) is contained in the upper ray of γ.

With Remark 3.6 and (3.4), one can check that the total order $<_Q^{U,1}$ and $<_Q^{U,2}$ make (α, β) minimal. Similarly, we can prove for the case when they are in the S-part of the a-swing.

(b) Now we deal with the following case:

$$(\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c) \text{ and } \gamma \text{ are in the different parts of the } a\text{-swing.}$$

Assume that γ is in N-part of the a-swing and ρ is the shallow maximal S-sectional path containing γ. Then one can prove that

$$\phi_1^{-1}(\gamma) < \phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_c - \varepsilon_b) \text{ implies } \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_c \text{ is in the } N\text{-part of the } a\text{-swing}$$

by using Theorem 1.20, Theorem 1.23 and Corollary 1.27. Thus the pair (α, β) satisfies the equations in Proposition 3.5. Then one can check that the total order $<_Q^{L,1}$ and $<_Q^{L,2}$ make (α, β) minimal as in (a).

By applying the similar arguments in this proof, one can prove for the remaining cases. □

Example 3.8. In Example 1.9, the four convex total orders in Remark 1.5 are given as follows:

$(<_Q^{U,1})$: $\{3,-4\} < \{2,-4\} < \{1,-4\} < \{2,3\} < \{2,-3\} < \{1,2\} < \{2,4\} < \{1,-3\} < \{1,3\} < \{1,4\} < \{1,-2\} < \{3,4\}$.

$(<_Q^{U,2})$: $\{3,-4\} < \{2,-4\} < \{1,-4\} < \{2,-3\} < \{2,3\} < \{1,2\} < \{2,4\} < \{1,3\} < \{1,-3\} < \{1,4\} < \{1,-2\} < \{3,4\}$.

$(<_Q^{L,1})$: $\{3,-4\} < \{2,-4\} < \{2,-3\} < \{2,3\} < \{1,-4\} < \{1,2\} < \{1,-3\} < \{1,3\} < \{2,4\} < \{1,4\} < \{3,4\} < \{1,-2\}$.
$(<_Q^{L,2})$: $\{3,-4\} < \{2,-4\} < \{2,3\} < \{2,-3\} < \{1,-4\} < \{1,2\} < \{1,3\} < \{1,-3\} < \{2,4\} < \{1,4\} < \{3,4\} < \{1,-2\}$.

For the rest of this paper, we say that *a pair* (α,β) *is minimal* when $\alpha+\beta \in \Phi_n^+$ and the pair is a minimal pair with respect to a suitable convex total order which is induced by some reduced expression $\widetilde{w}_0 \in [Q]$.

3.2. **Multiplicity free positive roots of the form $\varepsilon_a \pm \varepsilon_{n-1}$ and $\varepsilon_a \pm \varepsilon_n$.** As we observed in Lemma 1.13 and Corollary 1.18, position of the subset of multiplicity free positive roots

$$\{\varepsilon_a+\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon_a-\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon_b+\varepsilon_{n-1}, \varepsilon_b-\varepsilon_{n-1} \in \Phi_n^+ \mid a \le n-1,\ b \le n-2\}$$

depends on the value $\xi_{n-1}-\xi_n$ and the parity of n. In short, $\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha_{n-1}), \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha_n) \in \{n-1,n\}$ and

Case	$\lvert\xi_{n-1}-\xi_n\rvert$	$\phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_a \pm \varepsilon_n)$	$\phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_b \pm \varepsilon_{n-1})$
A	0	$n-1$ or n	less than $n-1$
B	2	less than $n-1$	$n-1$ or n

Remark 3.9. Let us consider the roots $\{\varepsilon_b+\varepsilon_{n-1} \mid b \le n-2\}$ for Case A. By Corollary 1.18, the set forms the maximal N-sectional path starting at $n-1$ and n if $\{n-1,n\}$ are sink in Q, or the maximal S-sectional path ending at $n-1$ and n if $\{n-1,n\}$ are sources in Q (see (1.19)).

For the set $\{\varepsilon_b-\varepsilon_{n-1} \mid b \le n-2\}$ of Case A, Theorem 1.23 tells that the set forms the shallow $(N,-(n-1))$-maximal path or $(S,-(n-1))$-maximal path (see Theorem 1.23).

For sets $\{\varepsilon_a+\varepsilon_n \mid a \le n-1\}$ and $\{\varepsilon_a-\varepsilon_n \mid a \le n-1\}$) of Case B, Corollary 1.18 tells that one of two set forms the maximal S-sectional path starting at level 1 and ending at level one of $n-1$ and n, and the another set forms the maximal N-sectional path ending at level 1 and ending at level one of $n-1$ and n (see (1.20)).

Proposition 3.10.

(a) *Take any root* γ *in* $\{\varepsilon_b+\varepsilon_{n-1}, \varepsilon_b-\varepsilon_{n-1} \in \Phi_n^+ \mid b \le n-2\}$ *when* $\lvert\xi_{n-1}-\xi_n\rvert = 0$. *Then all pair* (α,β) *of* γ *is a minimal pair. Moreover, one of the conditions in* (2.6) (i) *and* (iii) *holds when* $\phi^{-1}(\gamma)=(k,z)$, $\phi^{-1}(\beta)=(j,y)$ *and* $\phi^{-1}(\alpha)=(i,x)$.

(b) *Take any root* γ *in* $\{\varepsilon_a+\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon_a-\varepsilon_n \in \Phi_n^+ \mid a \le n-1\}$ *when* $\lvert\xi_{n-1}-\xi_n\rvert = 2$. *Then all pair* (α,β) *of* γ *is a minimal pair. Moreover, one of the conditions in* (2.6) (i) *and* (iii) *holds when* $\phi^{-1}(\gamma)=(k,z)$, $\phi^{-1}(\beta)=(j,y)$ *and* $\phi^{-1}(\alpha)=(i,x)$.

Proof. (a) Note that

- any sum of pair (α,β) with $\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha)$, $\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) \in \{n-1,n\}$ can not be $\gamma=\varepsilon_b-\varepsilon_{n-1}$,
- $\phi_1^{-1}(\gamma) \le n-2$.

Thus we can apply the same arguments in §3.1 for $\gamma = \varepsilon_b - \varepsilon_{n-1}$ to prove our assertion. More precisely, every pair (α, β) of $\gamma = \varepsilon_b - \varepsilon_{n-1}$ satisfies one of the conditions in Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 3.5.

For $\gamma = \varepsilon_b + \varepsilon_{n-1}$, there exist only two pairs

$$\big\{\{\alpha,\beta\},\ \{\alpha',\beta'\}\big\} = \big\{\{\varepsilon_{n-1}-\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon_b+\varepsilon_n\},\ \{\varepsilon_{n-1}+\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon_b-\varepsilon_n\}\big\}$$

such that $\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha), \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha'), \phi_1^{-1}(\beta), \phi_1^{-1}(\beta') \in \{n-1, n\}$. Then $\{\gamma, \varepsilon_{n-1}-\varepsilon_n\}$ and $\{\gamma, \varepsilon_{n-1}+\varepsilon_n\}$ are contained in the same maximal sectional paths, respectively. Then (α, β) and (α', β') become minimal pairs with respect to the total order $<_Q^{L,1}$ or $<_Q^{L,2}$. Moreover, one can check that it satisfies $\phi_1^{-1}(\gamma) < n-2 < \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha), \phi_1^{-1}(\beta)$ and the third condition in (2.6) (iii). For the other pairs of γ, we can apply the same arguments in §3.1 to prove our assertion.
(b) In this case, each $\gamma = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_n$ (resp. $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_n$) has a unique pair $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ in level $n-1$ and n as $\{\varepsilon_{n-1} - \varepsilon_n, \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_{n-1}\}$ (resp. $\{\varepsilon_{n-1} + \varepsilon_n, \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_{n-1}\}$). Then (α, β) becomes a minimal pair with respect to the total orders $<_Q^{L,1}$ and $<_Q^{L,2}$. The remaining assertions can be proved in the similar way of (a). For the other pairs, we can apply the same arguments in §3.1 to prove our assertion. □

Proposition 3.11. *Take a positive root of the form $\gamma = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}$ or $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}$. Then all pair (α, β) of γ satisfying one of the following two conditions:*

$$\begin{cases} n-1-\dfrac{|\phi_2^{-1}(\beta)-\phi_2^{-1}(\gamma)|}{2} = |\phi_2^{-1}(\gamma)-\phi_2^{-1}(\alpha)| & \text{if } \phi_1^{-1}(\beta)\in\{n-1,n\},\\ n-1-\dfrac{|\phi_2^{-1}(\alpha)-\phi_2^{-1}(\gamma)|}{2} = |\phi_2^{-1}(\gamma)-\phi_2^{-1}(\beta)| & \text{if } \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha)\in\{n-1,n\}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, one of the conditions in (2.6) (iii) *holds when $\phi^{-1}(\gamma) = (k, z)$ with $k = n$, $\phi^{-1}(\beta) = (j, y)$ and $\phi^{-1}(\alpha) = (i, x)$.*

Proof. Note that, in these cases, one of α and β should be contained in the level $n-1$ or n. For $\gamma = \varepsilon_a \pm \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}$, assume that $\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) \in \{n-1, n\}$ and $\phi_2^{-1}(\beta) < \phi_2^{-1}(\gamma)$; i.e.,

$$\phi_2^{-1}(\gamma) - \phi_2^{-1}(\beta) = 2k \text{ for some } 1 \le k \le n-2 \text{ and } \beta = \varepsilon_c \pm \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}\ (a < b).$$

By Corollary 1.26 (a), the N-part of the b-swing is longer than the S-part of the b-swing. Thus we have the subquiver in Γ_Q as follows:



if k is even,



if k is odd.

Then we can prove that κ_{u-1} contains $-\varepsilon_c$ as its summand and $N = \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b = \alpha$, by applying the technique in Proposition 3.3. Thus our assertions follow. For the other cases, we can prove by applying the similar arguments in this proof. □

Theorem 3.12. *For each positive root γ containing $\pm\varepsilon_{n-1}$ or $\pm\varepsilon_n$ as its summand, every pair (α,β) of γ is minimal and there exists a surjective homomorphism*

$$V_Q(\beta)\otimes V_Q(\alpha)\twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad S_Q(\beta)\otimes S_Q(\alpha)\twoheadrightarrow S_Q(\gamma).$$

Proof. Let us consider when $\phi_1^{-1}(\gamma)\in\{n-1,n\}$ first. Assume that $\phi_1^{-1}(\beta)\in\{n-1,n\}$ and $\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha)\notin\{n-1,n\}$. Then the previous proposition tells that $<_Q^{U,1}$ or $<_Q^{U,2}$ make (α,β) minimal. By Theorem 2.7 (c), we have such a surjection. Similarly, if $\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha)\in\{n-1,n\}$ and $\phi_1^{-1}(\beta)\notin\{n-1,n\}$, then $<_Q^{L,1}$ or $<_Q^{L,2}$ makes (α,β) minimal and we have such a surjection.

When $\phi_1^{-1}(\gamma)\le n-2$, Proposition 3.10 tells that our assertion holds. □

Thus we have a conclusion as follows:

(3.5) For every multiplicity free positive root γ, every pair (α,β) of γ is minimal with respect to a suitable total order which is compatible with $\preceq_Q$.

Theorem 3.13. *Let γ be a multiplicity free positive root γ. For every pair (α,β) of γ, we have*

(a) *$V_Q(\beta)\otimes V_Q(\alpha)$ and $S_Q(\beta)\circ S_Q(\alpha)$ have composition length two,*
(b) *there exist surjections $V_Q(\beta)\otimes V_Q(\alpha)\twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\gamma)$ and $S_Q(\beta)\circ S_Q(\alpha)\twoheadrightarrow S_Q(\gamma)$.*

Proof. It is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.7, Theorem 2.9 and (3.5). □

Remark 3.14. For a reduced expression $\widetilde{w}_0$ of the longest element w_0 of D_4

$$\widetilde{w}_0 = s_1s_2s_3s_1s_2s_4s_1s_2s_3s_1s_2s_4,$$

one can easily check that it is *not* adapted to any Dynkin quiver Q of type D_4. Moreover, for a multiplicity free positive root $\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4$, we have

$$\alpha_2+\alpha_3 \prec_{[\widetilde{w}_0]} \alpha_3 \prec_{[\widetilde{w}_0]} \alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4 \prec_{[\widetilde{w}_0]} \alpha_2+\alpha_4 \prec_{[\widetilde{w}_0]} \alpha_4$$

by considering all reduced expressions in $[\widetilde{w}_0]$. Equivalently, the pair $(\alpha_2+\alpha_3,\alpha_4)$ can not be minimal with respect to any convex total order compatible with $\prec_{[\widetilde{w}_0]}$ even though $\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4$ is multiplicity free.

3.3. **Multiplicity non-free positive root of the form $\varepsilon_a+\varepsilon_b$ for $b\le n-2$.** By Theorem 1.20, a multiplicity non-free positive root of the form $\varepsilon_a+\varepsilon_b$ for $b\le n-2$ is located at the intersection of the a-swing and the b-swing. More precisely,

- $\varepsilon_a+\varepsilon_b$ is located at the S-part of the a-swing and the N-part of the b-swing or
- $\varepsilon_a+\varepsilon_b$ is located at the N-part of the a-swing and the S-part of the b-swing.

For a pair (α,β) of $\alpha+\beta=\gamma=\varepsilon_a+\varepsilon_b$ $(b\le n-2)$, if α or β is in the same sectional paths containing γ, we can prove that

$$(\alpha,\beta) \text{ is a minimal pair of } \gamma,$$

by applying the same arguments in §3.1 and §3.2.

Comparing with multiplicity free positive roots in the previous subsections, multiplicity non-free positive roots of the form $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b$ for $b \leq n-2$ can have a pair (α, β) which are not in the same sectional paths containing $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b$.

In this subsection, we prove that there exist $(n-b-1)$-may pairs (α, β) of $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b$ which can not be minimal with respect to *any* convex total order compatible with $\preceq_Q$. However, we have still surjections

$$V_Q(\beta) \otimes V_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b) \quad \text{and} \quad S_Q(\beta) \circ S_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow S_Q(\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b)$$

for the non-minimal pair (α, β). Here, (α, β) is *non-minimal* means that (α, β) can not be a minimal pair of $\gamma = \alpha + \beta$ for any convex total order compatible with $\preceq_Q$.

Proposition 3.15. *Assume that there exists a pair (α, β) of $\alpha + \beta = \gamma = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b$ $(b \leq n-2)$ such that α and β are not in the same sectional paths containing γ. Then we have*

$$\phi_1^{-1}(\gamma) = 2n - 2 - \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) - \phi_1^{-1}(\beta). \tag{3.6}$$

Moreover,

(a) *we have surjections*

$$V_Q(\beta) \otimes V_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\gamma) \quad \textit{and} \quad S_Q(\beta) \circ S_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow S_Q(\gamma),$$

(b) *the pair (α, β) is a non-minimal pair.*

Proof. Note that $\{\alpha, \beta\} = \{\varepsilon_a \pm \varepsilon_c, \varepsilon_b \mp \varepsilon_c\}$ for some $a < b < c$. Assume that $\beta = \varepsilon_b - \varepsilon_c$ and γ is at the intersection of the N-part of the b-swing and the S-part of the a-swing. By assumptions, we have the following subquiver in Γ_Q as follows:



The existence such $\kappa_{u+1} = \varepsilon_e - \varepsilon_c$ is guaranteed by Theorem 1.23 and Corollary 1.18. Now we prove that κ_u exists and κ_u contains ε_c as its summand. if κ_u does not exist, then Corollary 1.26 (b) tells that $\kappa_{u+1} = \underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(1)$. Then β should be the same as $\beta = \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_c$ which is a contradiction to the assumption of b. Thus κ_u exists.

Now we claim that κ_u contains ε_c as its summand. If κ_{u+2} does not exists, κ_u contains ε_c. Thus we assume that κ_{u+2} exists. If κ_{u+2} contains ε_c as its summand and is in the S-part of the c-swing, we have an intersection of the shallow maximal $(N, -c)$-sectional path and the c-swing. But it can not happen. If κ_{u+2} contains ε_c as its summand and is in the S-part of the c-swing, $\phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_b + \varepsilon_c) < \phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_b - \varepsilon_c)$. But it can not happen, since, by the argument in Proposition 3.3, $\phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_b + \varepsilon_c)$ should be larger than $\phi_1^{-1}(\varepsilon_b - \varepsilon_c)$. Thus our claim follows.

Using the technique in the previous paragraph, one can prove that κ_u is in the S-part of the c-swing. Then the root N at the intersection of the c-swing and the a-swing becomes $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_c$. Observing the locations of α, β and γ, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) - 1\big) + \big(\phi_2^{-1}(\kappa_u) - \phi_2^{-1}(\kappa_{u+1})\big) + \big(\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) - 1\big)& \\ = \big(n - 1 - \phi_1^{-1}(\beta)\big) + 2\big(n - 1 - \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma)\big) + \big(n - 1 - \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha)\big)&.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\big(\phi_2^{-1}(\kappa_u) - \phi_2^{-1}(\kappa_{u+1})\big) = 2$, we have (3.6). By (2.6) (ii), we have a surjective homomorphism (a).

Note that there exists a pair $(\varepsilon_b - \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}, \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}})$ of $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b$. Since there exist sectional paths from β to $\varepsilon_b - \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}$ and from $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_{\mathtt{t}}$ to α, (α, β) can not be a minimal pair with respect to any total order compatible with $\preceq_Q$ by Remark 1.7.

For the other cases, we can apply the same argument given in this proof. □

Corollary 3.16. *For a non-minimal pair* (α, β) *in* Proposition 3.15, $d_{V_Q(\beta),V_Q(\alpha)}(z)$ *has a zero of multiplicity* 2 *at* $z = (-q)^{|\phi_2^{-1}(\alpha) - \phi_2^{-1}(\beta)|}$.

Proof. From Proposition 3.15, we can easily check that

$$\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha), \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) \le n - 2, \quad \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) + \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) \ge n \quad \text{and hence} \quad \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha), \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) > 1.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_2^{-1}(\alpha) - \phi_2^{-1}(\beta)& \\ &= n - 1 - \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) + n - 1 - \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) + 2\left(n - 1 - \big(2n - 2 - \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) - \phi_1^{-1}(\beta)\big)\right) \\ &= \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) + \phi_1^{-1}(\beta),\end{aligned}$$

our assertion follows from (2.13). □

Theorem 3.17. *For a multiplicity non-free positive root* $\gamma = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b$, $(n - b - 1)$*-many non-minimal pairs of* γ *exist.*

Proof. Note that

- a pair (α, β) of γ is of the form $(\varepsilon_a \pm \varepsilon_c, \varepsilon_b \mp \varepsilon_c)$ or $(\varepsilon_b \mp \varepsilon_c, \varepsilon_a \pm \varepsilon_c)$ for some $b < c$,
- there are $(n - b - 1)$-roots in the shorter part of the b-swing.

Let $a = i_{\sigma_k}$, $b = i_{\sigma_l}$ $(k \ne l)$ and $1 = i_{\sigma_\ell}$ as in (1.24). Then either $l < k \le \ell$, $l > k \ge \ell$, $k \ge \ell \ge l$ or $l \ge \ell \ge k$ by Corollary 1.26 (b).

(i) Assume that $l > k \ge \ell$. By Corollary 1.26, for any positive root $\varepsilon_b \mp \varepsilon_c$ in the S-part of the b-swing, we have the following subquiver of Γ_Q as follows:



Thus it suffices to show that $\varepsilon_a \pm \varepsilon_c$ is in the N-part of the a-swing. Assume $\beta = \varepsilon_a \pm \varepsilon_c$ is contained in the S-part. If $\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) < \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma)$, it is a contradiction to the convexity of $\prec_Q$. If $\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) > \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma)$, then Corollary 1.16 tells that $\beta = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_c$ and hence c-swing is located between a-swing and b-swing. However, it is a contradiction to Corollary 1.26 (b). Hence β must contained in the N-part of the a-swing. We can prove for the case $l < k \leq \ell$ by using the similar argument.

(ii) Assume $k \geq \ell \geq l$. By Corollary 1.26, for any positive root $\varepsilon_b \mp \varepsilon_c$ in the N-part of the b-swing, we have the following subquiver of Γ_Q as follows:



Assume $\beta = \varepsilon_a \pm \varepsilon_c$ is contained in the N-part. If $\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) > \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma)$, it is a contradiction to the convexity of $\prec_Q$. If $\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) < \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma)$, then Corollary 1.16 tells that $\beta = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_c$ and hence c-swing is located either between a-swing and 1-swing, or between c-swing and 1-swing. However, both cases yields a contradiction to Corollary 1.26 (b). Hence β must contained in the S-part of the a-swing. We can prove for the case $l \geq \ell \geq k$ by using the similar argument. □

Corollary 3.18. *For a pair (α, β) of $\alpha + \beta = \gamma \in \Phi^+$, assume that α or β (or both) are contained in the same sectional path(s) of γ. Then (α, β) is minimal.*

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of the preceding theorem. □

Corollary 3.19. *For a positive roots $\gamma \in \Phi^+$,*

(i) *the number of minimal pairs of γ is $|\mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 1}(\gamma)| - 1$,*
(ii) *the number of non-minimal pairs of γ is $|\mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 2}(\gamma)|$.*

Hence the number of pairs (α, β) of $\gamma = \alpha + \beta$ is the same as $\mathrm{ht}(\gamma) - 1$, where $\mathrm{ht}(\gamma) = \sum_{i \in I} n_i$ for $\gamma = \sum_{i \in I} n_i \alpha_i$.

Proof. For a multiplicity free root γ, $|\mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 1}(\gamma)| = \mathrm{ht}(\gamma)$. Then out assertion follows from the easy observation that the number of pairs of $\gamma = |\mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 1}(\gamma)| - 1$ and (3.5) in this case.

For a multiplicity non-free root $\gamma = \varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b = \sum_{a \leq k < b} \alpha_k + 2 \sum_{j \leq k \leq n-2} \alpha_k + \alpha_{n-1} + \alpha_n$, one of the pair (α, β) of γ should be the one of the following forms:

$$\varepsilon_b \pm \varepsilon_k \ \ (b < k \leq n) \text{ or } \varepsilon_c + \varepsilon_b \ \ (a < c < b).$$

Thus the number of pairs of γ is

$$2(n - b) + (b - a - 1) = 2n - a - b - 1,$$

which is the same as $\mathrm{ht}(\gamma) - 1$. Then our assertion follows from Theorem 3.17 and the observations that $|\mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 1}(\gamma)| = n - a + 1$ and $|\mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 2}(\gamma)| = n - b - 1$. □

Example 3.20. In Example 1.9, the longest root $\gamma = \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 = \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4$ has

$$\mathrm{ht}(\gamma) = 5, \quad |\mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 1}(\gamma)| = 4 \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 2}(\gamma)| = 1.$$

One can easily check that

- $(\{1,-4\},\{2,-4\})$, $(\{1,3\},\{2,-3\})$, $(\{1,-3\},\{2,3\})$, $(\{1,4\},\{2,-4\})$ are pairs of γ,
- $(\{1,-4\},\{2,-4\})$, $(\{1,3\},\{2,-3\})$, $(\{1,-3\},\{2,3\})$ are minimal pairs of γ,
- $(\{1,4\},\{2,-4\})$ is only the non-minimal pairs of γ.

By Proposition 3.15 and Corollary 3.16, we know that the surjective homomorphism

$$V_Q(\beta) \otimes V_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\gamma) \quad \text{for a non-minimal pair } (\alpha,\beta) \text{ of } \gamma$$

arises from (2.6) (ii). Conversely, for every minimal pair (α,β) of γ, the surjective homomorphism $V_Q(\beta) \otimes V_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\gamma)$ arises from the other surjective homomorphisms in Theorem 2.3. Thus we have the following Theorem by (2.13):

Theorem 3.21.

(1) $d_{V_Q(\beta),V_Q(\alpha)}(z)$ *for a minimal pair* (α,β) *of* $\gamma \in \Phi_n^+$ *has a zero of multiplicity* 1 *at* $z = (-q)^{|\phi_2^{-1}(\alpha)-\phi_2^{-1}(\beta)|}$,

(2) $d_{V_Q(\beta),V_Q(\alpha)}(z)$ *for a non-minimal pair* (α,β) *of* $\gamma \in \Phi_n^+$ *has a zero of multiplicity* 2 *at* $z = (-q)^{|\phi_2^{-1}(\alpha)-\phi_2^{-1}(\beta)|}$.

4. Further applications

4.1. **Category $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(2)}$.** Using the map * in (2.9), we define the category $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(2)}$ in $\mathscr{C}_{D_{n+1}^{(2)}}$ as follows (see also [16]):

Definition 4.1. Let Φ_n^+ be the set of positive roots of finite type D_{n+1}. The subcategory $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(2)}$ is the smallest abelian full subcategory of $\mathscr{C}_{D_{n+1}^{(2)}}$ satisfying

(a) $\mathsf{V}_Q(\beta) \in \mathscr{C}_Q^{(2)}$ for all $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$,

(b) it is stable by taking submodule, subquotient, tensor product and extension.

Proposition 4.2. *For every positive root* $\gamma \in \Phi_{n+1}^+$ *with* $\mathrm{ht}(\gamma) \geq 2$ *and every minimal pair* (α,β) *of* γ, *there exists a surjective* $U_q'(D_{n+1}^{(2)})$*-module homomorphism*

$$\mathsf{V}_Q(\beta) \otimes \mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow \mathsf{V}_Q(\gamma). \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. As we observed in Theorem 3.21, for every minimal pair (α,β) of γ, the surjective homomorphism $V_Q(\beta) \otimes V_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\gamma)$ arises from (2.6) (i) or (iii). Thus Remark 2.5 tells that (4.1) always exists for a minimal pair (α,β) of γ, which yields our assertion. □

From Proposition 4.2, the condition (a) in Definition 4.1 can be re-written as follows also:

(a′) $\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k)$ for all $\alpha_k \in \Pi_{n+1}$.

4.2. **Convolution of $S_Q(\beta)$ for β's in the sectional path.** This subsection can be regarded as an analogue of [30, §3.3].

Proposition 4.3. *For any Dynkin quiver Q and α, $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$ contained in the same sectional path,*

$$S_Q(\alpha) \circ S_Q(\beta) \simeq S_Q(\beta) \circ S_Q(\alpha) \text{ is simple.}$$

Proof. By Theorem 1.20 and Theorem 1.23, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\phi_2^{-1}(\alpha) - \phi_2^{-1}(\beta)| = |\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) - \phi_1^{-1}(\beta)| && \text{if } \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha), \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) \le n-2,\\
&|\phi_2^{-1}(\alpha) - \phi_2^{-1}(\beta)| = n-1-k && \text{if } \{\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha), \phi_1^{-1}(\beta)\} = \{n-1, k\} \text{ or } \{n, k\},\\
&|\phi_2^{-1}(\alpha) - \phi_2^{-1}(\beta)| = 0 && \text{if } \{\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha), \phi_1^{-1}(\beta)\} = \{n-1, n\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (2.11) and Theorem 2.2, we have

$$V_Q(\alpha) \otimes V_Q(\beta) \simeq V_Q(\beta) \otimes V_Q(\alpha) \text{ is simple.}$$

Thus our assertion follows from Theorem 2.9. □

Corollary 4.4. *Choose $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-2\}$ and let $\{\beta_{j_k} \mid 1 \le k \le a-1\}$ be the set of all positive root containing $-\varepsilon_a$ as their summand. Then we have*

$$\mathop{\circ}_{k=1}^{a-1} S_Q(\beta_{j_k}) \text{ is simple.}$$

Proof. Our assertions are immediate consequences of Theorem 1.23 and Proposition 4.3. □

References

1. T. Akasaka and M. Kashiwara, *Finite-dimensional representations of quantum affine algebras*, Publ. RIMS. Kyoto Univ., **33** (1997), 839-867.
2. M. Auslander, I. Reiten and S. Smalo, *Representation theory of Artin algebras*, Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics **36**, Cambridge 1995.
3. I. Assem, D. Simson and A. Skowroński, *Elements of the representation theory of associative algebras. Vol.1*, London Math. Soc. Student Texts **65**, Cambridge 2006.
4. R. Bedard, *On commutation classes of reduced words in Weyl groups*, European J. Combin. **20** (1999), 483–505.
5. N. Bourbaki. *Éléments de mathématique. Fasc. XXXIV. Groupes et algèbres de Lie. Chapitres IV–VI.* Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles, No. 1337. Hermann, Paris, 1968.
6. J. Brundan, A. Kleshchev and P. J. McNamara, *Homological properties of finite Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras*, Duke Math. J., **163** (2014), 1353–1404.
7. V. Chari and D. Hernadez, *Beyond Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules, In Quantum affine algebras, extended affine Lie algebras, and their applications*, Contemp. Math., **506**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, (2010), 49–81.
8. V. Chari and A. Pressley, *A guide to Quantum Groups*, Cambridge U. Press, Cambridge, 1994.

9. ———, *Yangians, integrable quantum systems and Dorey's rule*, Comm. Math. Phys. **181** (1996), no. 2, 265-302.
10. ———, *Quantum affine algebras and affine Hecke algebras*, Pacific J. Math. **174** (2) (1996), 295-326.
11. I. V. Cherednik, *A new interpretation of Gelfand-Tzetlin bases*, Duke Math. J. **54** (1987), 563-577.
12. E. Frenkel and N. Reshetikhin, *The q-characters of representations of and deformations of W-algebras in quantum affine algebras* in Recent Developments in Quantum Affine Algebras and Related Topics, (Raleigh, N.C., 1998), Contemp. Math. **248**, Amer. Math. Soc., (Providence), (1999), 163–205.
13. P. Gabriel, *Auslander-Reiten sequences and Representation-finite algebras*, Lecture notes in Math., vol. 831, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1980, pp.1.71.
14. V. Ginzburg , N. Reshetikhin and E. Vasserot, *Quantum groups and flag varieties*, A.M.S. Contemp. Math. **175** (1994), 101-130.
15. V. Ginzburg and É. Vasserot, *Langlands reciprocity for affine quantum groups of type A_n*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (1993), no. 3, 67–85.
16. D. Hernandez, *Kirillov-Reshetikhin conjecture: the general case*, Int. Math. Res. Not. 2010 (1) (2010), 149–193.
17. D. Hernandez and B. Leclerc, *Cluster algebras and quantum affine algebras*, Duke Math. J. **154** (2) (2010), 265-341.
18. D. Hernandez and B. Leclerc, *Quantum Grothendieck rings and derived Hall algebras*, arXiv:1109.0862v2 [math.QA], to appear in J. Reine Angew. Math.
19. M. Jimbo, *A q-analogue of $U(\mathfrak{gl}_{N+1})$, Hecke algebra, and the Yang-Baxter equation*, Lett. Math.Phys. **11** (1986), 247-252.
20. V. Kac, *Infinite dimensional Lie algebras*, 3rd ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
21. S.-J. Kang, M. Kashiwara and M. Kim, *Symmetric quiver Hecke algebras and R-matrices of quantum affine algebras*, arXiv:1304.0323 [math.RT].
22. ———, *Symmetric quiver Hecke algebras and R-matrices of quantum affine algebras II*, arXiv:1308.0651 [math.RT], to appear in Duke Math. J.
23. M. Kashiwara, *On level zero representations of quantum affine algebras*, Duke. Math. J. **112** (2002), 117–175.
24. S. Kato, *Poincaré-Birkhoff-Witt bases and Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras*, Duke Math. J. **163**, 3 (2014), 619–663.
25. M. Khovanov and A. D. Lauda, *A diagrammatic approach to categorification of quantum groups I*, Represent. Theory **13** (2009), 309–347.
26. ———, *A diagrammatic approach to categorification of quantum groups II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **363** (2011), no. 5, 2685–2700.
27. P. McNamara, *Finite dimensional representations of Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras I: finite type*, arXiv:1207.5860 [math.RT], to appear in J. Reine Angew. Math.
28. H. Nakajima, *Quiver varieties and finite-dimensional representations of quantum affine algebras*, J. Amer.Math. Soc. **14** (2001), 145–238.
29. S-j. Oh, *The Denominators of normalized R-matrices of types $A^{(2)}_{2n-1}$, $A^{(2)}_{2n}$, $B^{(1)}_n$ and $D^{(2)}_{n+1}$*, arXiv:1404.6715v3 [math.QA].
30. ———, *Auslander-Reiten quiver of type A and generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality*, arXiv:1405.3336v2 [math.RT].
31. P. Papi, *A characterization of a special ordering in a root system*, Proc. Amer. Math. **120** (1994), 661–665.
32. C. Ringel, *PBW-bases of quantum groups*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **470** (1996), pp. 51–88.
33. R. Rouquier, *2 Kac-Moody algebras*, arXiv:0812.5023 (2008).

School of Mathematics, Korea Institute for Advanced Study Seoul 130-722, Korea
E-mail address: sejin092@gmail.com